Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

REFERENCE MATERIAL
Do not Remove
from the Library

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

THE QUERISTS' DRAWER

A DISCUSSION OF DIFFICULT
SUBJECTS AND PASSAGES
OF THE SCRIPTURES

BY

ISAAC ERRETT,

EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN
STANDARD

ARRANGED AND EDITED BY

Z. T. SWEENEY

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

CINCINNATI:
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

Copyrighted, 1910,
by
The Standard Publishing Co.

Introduction

In presenting the "Querists' Drawer" to the Christian reading public, as a separate volume, I beg to say that the thought of doing so was suggested to me by the author himself. When going with him to Palestine, we had many talks concerning his great life-work through the CHRISTIAN STANDARD. He pointed out several departments of it and spoke of their comparative values. The one that seemed of as great value to him as any other forms the title to this great book. He spoke freely of the great pains he had taken to inform himself and to answer carefully and conscientiously the questions received from his readers. He said, upon one occasion, that a very large part of his brains was contained in the "Querists' Drawer."

There were two or three other features to which he attached great importance. These may form the subject of forthcoming volumes, but that which was pre-eminent in his mind has been made the subject of this first volume.

It has been a labor of love with the editor to carefully collect such articles, for this work has set forth most clearly the Biblical view of the questions discussed.

With the sincere hope that the book may be read with both profit and pleasure, it is committed to the Christian world.

Very sincerely,

Z. T. SWEENEY, Editor.

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

Table of Contents

Abraham, Idolatry of 11
Adam, Death of 11
Amusements 12
Animals, Value of blood 15
Antichrist 16
Apostles, Are they permanent in the church? 16
Apostolic succession, Arguments against 20
Ark, Noah's, Description of 20
Assessments, Church 22
Assurance, how maintained 23
Authority of English Church 29
Babylon deserted 32
Baptism a command 32
Baptism a seal and sign 32
Baptism, A second 33
Baptism by one Spirit 34
Baptism in Spirit and fire 35
Baptism, John's, not sufficient 37
Baptism, Roman Catholic view of 39
Baptism, Virtue of 41
Baptism, When valid 41
Baptisms, Doctrine of 42
Bapto vs. Baptizo 43
Believers, Signs shall follow 46
Bible the pure word of God 47
Birth of water and Spirit 48
Bishops, Plurality in each congregation 48
Blood of Christ for individuals 51
Born of God—Do not commit sin 52
Business, The Lord's 53
Campbell, Alexander, a Baptist 53
Children and the kingdom 54
Children obeying the gospel 55

Children, Preaching for 56
Children of the kingdom 58
Christ's Divinity vs. Deity 58
Christ made a high priest 59
Christ, Morality of 59
Christ's Resurrection 61
Christian Church 62
Christian Connection, Doctrine and practice 63
Christians and beer 64
Christians and the siege of Jerusalem 65
Christians, Individual responsibility of 65
Christians, Their relation to sects 67
Christmas, History of 68
Church comity 70
Church debts 70
Church, Greek Catholic vs. Roman Catholic 73
Church vs. the kingdom 75
Church letters 77
Church-member, Charges against 77
Church, Minority vs. majority in 79
Church on earth 81
Circumcision not with hands 82
Circumcision of Timothy 83
Circuses, Christians attending 84
Citizenship, Roman 86
Civil government and Christians 87
Colenso, Bishop 89
Collection, Duty of 90
Communism, Christian 90
Commission, To whom given 91
Communion, Christian 92
Common view of the founder of Nineveh 95
Communion for the unimmersed now 97
Communion loaf 98
Communion, Who may partake 98
Companion, Unbelieving 100
Confirmation of believers 100
Conversion, Miraculous 101
Corner-stone laying 107
Covenant-breaking 107-108
Covenants, New vs. old 109

Creation, Moses' account of 111
Creature made subject to vanity 115
Dead Sea, Typical 118
Dead, State of 120
Death of our Lord 122
Death and soul-sleeping 123
Death sentence by the Jews 124
Decalogue, Is it binding? 125
Dedications 126
Depravity 127
Dismissal, Letter of 129
Divine sovereignty 130
Divinity of Christ, Denial of 133
Doctrine and duty in Old Testament 134
Doctrine, Form of 135
Dogs, Who were they? 136
Elder, How made and unmade 136
Elder of good report 137
Elijah, Was John the Baptist 139
Expulsion of members 141
Faith and belief 143
Faith and repentance 144
Faith, Is it voluntary? 145
Faith produces life 146
Faith, The 147
Faith, The, essential to salvation 147
Falling away 148
Family, Providing for 150
Family worship 151
Fasting 153
Fellowship, Apostolic 153
Fellowship, Hand of 155
Feet-washing, Origin of 156
Feet-washing, Is it a church ordinance? 157
Festivals 157
Flesh, Sowing unto 159
Foreordination 159
Forgiveness of our fellow-men 161
Forgiveness, When a duty 162
Funerals 165
God, Justice and mercy of 167

Gospel, Forerunner of civil liberty..... 169
Hands, Laying on of..... 172
Happiness, Degrees of..... 174
Healing by anointing..... 175
Hearing from an Adventist..... 176
Heart in religion..... 177
Heathen, Destiny of..... 177
Holy Spirit, Baptism of..... 178
Holy Spirit, Blasphemy against..... 180
Holy Spirit, Gift vs. baptism of..... 181
Holy Spirit helping and interceding..... 183
Holy Spirit, How received..... 184
Holy Spirit, Pray for..... 185
Holy Spirit, Paul's reception of..... 186
Holy Spirit, Renewing of..... 187
Holy Spirit works change in man..... 188
Honesty, Is it enough?..... 189
Husband and wife, Separation of..... 190
Immersion and Greek Church..... 192
Immersion in history..... 193
Immersion, Objection to..... 195
Immersion, Trine, Early writers on..... 197
Immersion, Trine..... 202
Immersion, Trine, Origin of..... 204
Immersion, Trine, valid..... 206
Immersion universally accepted..... 208
Immortality, God only hath..... 208
Infant baptism, Origin of..... 209
Inspiration, Meaning of..... 210
Insurance, Is life, wrong?..... 210
Israel finally saved..... 211
Jacob and Esau..... 211
Jesuitism..... 213
Jesus, Priesthood of..... 217
Job, Book of, Author of..... 219
Judging between members..... 223
Judas, His responsibility..... 224
Judgment, Standards of..... 224
Kingdom, Keys of..... 225
Kingdom, Should we pray for it to come?..... 226
Kingdom, When established..... 227

Kiss, The holy 228
Law, The, fulfilled in Christ 229
Law, The, Is it still in force? 230
Law, The, Is it supreme? 232
Life and death 232
Lord's Day and labor 233
Lord's Day in history 235
Lord's table, Who may partake 237
Love-feasts 238
Love of the brethren 241
Mammon, Use of 242
Marriage, Divine 244
Marriage relations 246
Marriage with unbelievers 247
Masonry and Christians 248
Melchizedek 253
Methodists 255
Mind, Carnal 256
Mind, Does it grow? 257
Money, Use of 258
Moses, Body of 258
Nathanael 259
New Testament, Canon of 260
Opinion, Liberty of 262
Ordination 263
Persecution, By whom practiced 265
Polygamy in early church 266
Prayer, Answer to 267
Prayer, Lord's 268
Prayer, What are the legitimate results of? 269
Prosperity, Worldly 269
Providence, Special 271
Punishment, Capital 273
Quickened, When are we? 274
Reconciliation between brethren 274
Recreation 275
Regeneration 278
Religion, Getting 280
Repentance and faith 281
Resurrection, Order of 282
Reward, Youth vs. age 282

Sabbath never changed..... 283
Sabbatarianism, Is it Christian?..... 283
Saints, Condition after death..... 284
Salvation by third person..... 284
Salvation, Is it arbitrary?..... 285
Salvation of grace..... 287
Salvation during Dark Ages..... 289
Sanctification of unbelievers..... 291
Scepter of Judah..... 291
Scriptures our guide..... 292
Scriptures, Protestant vs. Romish view..... 293
Secrecy, Why enjoined..... 294
Sectarianism, Its benefits..... 294
Sick, Healing of..... 295
Signs accompanied believers..... 297
Sins going before..... 298
Soul-sleeping, Do we teach?..... 298
Soul vs. spirit..... 299
Sunday-school, Who should teach?..... 301
Sunday-school, Relation of, to church..... 302
Supper, The Lord's, How to be observed..... 303
Surety for Christians..... 305
Tobacco chewing vs. smoking..... 306
Trinty, In the name of..... 306
Unclean spirits..... 307
Union, Is it desirable?..... 308
Usury, When wrong..... 308
Water, Clean, sprinkled..... 314
Water made wine..... 315
Williams, Roger..... 316
Wine, Communion..... 316
Witnesses, Qualifications of..... 317
Word, Sincere milk of..... 321
Words, Idle..... 322
Works, Dead..... 323
Worship, Is singing..... 325
Worship should benefit..... 326

THE QUERISTS' DRAWER

Abraham's Idolatry. What and where is the proof that Abraham was an idolater? You assert that he was in your "Talks to Bereans." BEREAN.

See Josh. 24:2: "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nachor: and *they* served other gods." See, also, verse 15.

Adam, Death of. Will you be so kind as to explain the character or nature of the death that Adam died for eating the forbidden fruit? If spiritual, how do you avoid unconditional universal salvation? for it is said in 1 Cor. 15:22, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" If this be true, then there is none lost. If temporal, how did he die in the day he ate the fruit, and live nine hundred and thirty years? for it is said in Gen. 3:17, "For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." N.

Death, in the Scriptures, does not always refer to the body. For instance, when Paul says, "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. 5:6); and when he again speaks of those that were "dead in trespasses and in sins" (Eph. 2:1); and when Jesus says, "Let the dead bury their dead." But, whatever may be the import of the word "die" in Genesis, it is evident that Paul in 1 Cor. 15 is treating of the *resurrection of the body,* and there ought to be no mistake, therefore, in understanding the death in Adam of which he speaks as meaning the death of the body, and the making alive in

Christ as meaning the resurrection of the body; and this favors the idea that "die," in Genesis, refers to the death of the body. There is "universal salvation" from the grave; for the same "many" that go down into death by virtue of their relationship to Adam (Rom. 5: 18, 19), shall come up again from the dead by virtue of the obedience unto death of our Lord Jesus Christ. Then, if they have no sins of their own to answer for, as is the case with infants and all irresponsible persons, they will enjoy eternal life; but if they have sins of their own to answer for, there is salvation for them only through the gospel. There is salvation in Christ from "many offenses," as well as from the sin of Adam; but the difference is this: salvation from the consequences of the sin of Adam is *unconditional,* and flows to the whole race; salvation from our personal sins is *conditional,* and depends on our personal acceptance of the conditions of salvation. This distinction is marked in Rom. 5: 16, 17.

The fact of Adam living so many years before the sentence was fully executed, presents no real difficulty. The sentence was slowly working out all that time. "Dying, thou shalt die," is the marginal reading. He began to die immediately; from that day it was a descent to the grave.

At the same time, whether included in the sentence or not, Adam did die a spiritual death as the result of that transgression. It separated him from God. He was no longer fit for the divine presence, and therefore hid himself, and henceforth he was shut out from the happy intercourse with his Creator which he had formerly enjoyed.

Amusements. 1. Is it wrong for Christians to make or attend social parties for dancing and card-playing?

2. If so, what is the duty of the church in relation to its

members who make, frequent, and in various ways encourage such parties?

3. What course should the preacher pursue in order to be faithful in relation to these matters?

1. It is not necessary to discuss the question whether dancing or card-playing is a sin *per se*. It is enough to know that, in this country, dancing parties and parties for card-playing are on the wrong side of the line, and in their legitimate tendencies lead away from Christ, and not to him. It is not merely that they are not promotive of piety, for of business in general, and of recreation in general, it must be said that they are not promotive of piety—yet they are necessary. If entered on from right motives, they are not destructive of piety, but, like everything that is right and needful, will at least indirectly strengthen religious life. But of the amusements referred to by our correspondent, it has to be said that, as practiced in this country, they are destructive of piety. They are in the hands of the worldly, and are managed in the interest of the ungodly; and it is a sad and base bowing of the knee to the spirit of this world when Christians allow themselves to yield to the entreaties of worldliness and "join themselves unto Baal-peor."

We are aware that, in many instances, these practices are confined to the parlor, within proper hours, and away from the promiscuous associations of the ballroom; and we are not disposed to deny that, thus managed, much of objection is removed. But we are also aware that it is impossible to confine it within such limits. Those who are indulged in the witchery of the dance and of gaming in the private circle, are soon led into a wider circle of enchantment, nor can it be checked. The tendencies are so strong and irresistible in the wrong direction that there is peril to the soul in meddling with that class of

witcheries. We are aware of the *legitimate* demand for amusements. We are not at all disposed to ignore it. Young people must have fun, and older ones are none the worse for it. It is not a true piety that denies all play to the tired faculties and jaded powers, and insists on making all the scenes of social life seriously and severely dignified and solemn. We concede that the question of lawful recreations demands more attention than it receives. But it is not our purpose now to point out lawful recreations, but to warn against unlawful ones. We could wish to see the drama and the dance and other recreations redeemed from evil influences, but we are not simple enough to dream of any such desirable result in this age and in this land. It is, to say the very least, a debatable land, from the border of which all prudent souls will retreat for safety.

2, 3. That depends on circumstances. We have known serious harm done by unwise management of such cases. (1) There should be faithful and kind instruction given from the pulpit, pointing out the evils and dangers of such conformity to the world. (2) There should be private and earnest labor with those who indulge in this way. (3) There should be wise and faithful efforts to counteract such tendencies by enlisting the members of the church in activities of another kind. (4) Suitable amusements and social attractions should be provided. There is more wisdom in providing proper recreations, than in denouncing such as are usually resorted to. (5) It is not worth while to argue the abstract question of dancing or card-playing. It is an offense to the multitude of good and pious people; that ought to be enough, and, unless conscience is dead, it will be enough. No Christian or Christian family, whatever their own notions or predilections may be, will sacrifice

the peace of the church and grieve worthy brethren by persisting in practices which give offense. (6) If, after it is thus fairly set before them, they insist on having their own way, and violate the law of love which requires them to yield their own preferences for the sake of their brethren, they ought to be dealt with as offenders against the peace of the church. In very few cases, however, will it ever come to this.

We have written this with special reference to dancing and card-playing in social circles. In regard to balls and public card-tables, the sin is so rank and the mischiefs so patent that there should be no hesitation in dealing with offenders, just as with any other offenders against the purity and honor of the church—always patiently and kindly, but firmly.

The currents of worldliness are very deep and strong. We must beware. Our growth in wealth is subjecting us to numerous subtle but powerful and corrupting influences of pride, pleasure, fashion and carnal ambitions. They are difficult to resist. They come in apparently harmless guise. They have the charm of the serpent, the soothing and grateful deceit of the vampire. We must not attempt to sail around the edge of whirlpools. We must keep on safe ground, and never forget the friendship of the world is enmity against God.

Animals, Blood of, Value of. For what purpose was the blood of animals offered under the Mosaic law?

We believe that the Israelites, living in obedience to their law, were justified; but was there anything in their law to take away sins?

Were not the Israelites saved through the blood of Christ, as we are to-day? J. W. HIATT.

1. Paul says that the blood of Jewish sacrifices "sanctified to the purifying of the flesh" (Heb. 9:13), and

that these, with various ordinances, were "imposed on them until the time of reformation." Those sacrifices could not take away sin. (Heb. 10:1-4.) They were *patterns* or *types* of heavenly things, and served to familiarize the mind with the idea of redemption from sin by sacrifice, but they had no power to save from sin.

2. As no Israelite ever lived in perfect obedience to the law, no Israelite was ever justified by it.

3. Jesus died "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, that they that were called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Heb. 9:15). He is "set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare God's righteousness in forgiving the sins of the *past*," as well as to declare *at this time* his righteousness in forgiving sins (Rom. 3:25).

Antichrist. If the Roman Church is the man of sin spoken of in 2 Thess. 2, when did it cease to be a church of Christ, and become antichrist?

Gradually, as Paul intimates. The spirit of apostasy was then at work, and John says that in his time this spirit of antichrist was already in the world (1 John 4:3). It assumed various phases. In the Church of Rome it became manifest in the assumption of authority and power that belong to God alone—to bind the consciences of men, to make and change laws, and to require a submission to the teaching of men which is due only to Christ. (See Matt. 23:8-11.) It has culminated in the assumption of the infallibility of the Roman pontiff.

Apostles, Are They Permanent in the Church? Why is not this practiced in the church as it was then, if you claim that your teaching harmonizes with the teaching of Scripture and the apostles, and why not practice and observe it? Also Acts 19:1-7.

I find also in Heb. 6:1, 2, that the laying on of hands is a principle of the doctrine. Also in 1 Tim. 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Acts 6:6: "Whom they set before the apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them."

If the Christian Church is restored to its ancient simplicity and purity, should it not have the same organization of (1) apostles, (2) prophets, (3) teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps and governments, diversities of tongues, as I find in 1 Cor. 12:28: "And God hath set some in the church, first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues" (Eph. 4:11-13).

I find in Acts 13:1, 2, that there were prophets in the church of Christ. In 1 Cor. 14:37: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." I find in the twenty-ninth verse of the same chapter, the apostle says: "Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues."

I find in Isa. 59:20, 21, that the words of Christ were never to cease nor to depart out of the mouth of his followers, or seed of Christ: "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that shall turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

MANNVILLE, Ind.

To get at once into the heart of these questions, we say:

1. So far as the *personal* ministry of the apostles is concerned, it closed with their earthly lives, and they had no successors; they never spoke of successors in their office, made no provisions for them, and gave no directions about them. They made provisions for the continued preaching of the gospel and teaching of Christian

duties (2 Tim. 2:1, 2), but not for a succession of apostles. Timothy was not an apostle, but an evangelist (2 Tim. 4:5), and those to whom he was to commit the gospel were not apostles.

2. So far as their apostolic authority is concerned, they need no successors; for they declared the whole counsel of God, and their death did not interfere with the living power of the truth they uttered. Because Christ left the earth, must other Christs appear from age to age? Must we have a succession of Christs? Certainly not. Well, then, why must we have a succession of apostles and prophets from age to age? Their authority, like that of the Christ who gave them their authority, is in force to-day; and, to adopt the language of a text quoted by our querist from Isaiah, the words which Jesus put into the mouths of the apostles *shall not depart* from coming generations, from henceforth and forever. The apostles and prophets were the *foundation* of the Christian temple, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, and they are a foundation *for all ages;* it does not need to have a new foundation laid every generation of new material. (Eph. 2:19-22.) One foundation is enough for all time. We have no more need of new apostles than we have of a new Christ.

3. These supernaturally endowed officers were only to continue *until* a certain end was gained; that is, until the whole will of God was revealed, and "the saints"—entire body of the saints—should be fitted to carry on whatever work of ministry was necessary for the edification of the church (Eph. 4:8-16). That that time did arrive, is evident from the fact that these gifts were withdrawn. Moreover, Paul regarded those gifts as the belongings of infancy (1 Cor. 13:8-11), and declared that they would *cease*. He points Christians away from

the miraculous gifts of which he speaks in that Epistle, in the passage quoted by our querist, to "a more excellent way," and declares them to be "nothing" in comparison with the "love" which was always to abide. Nothing is clearer than that in this chapter, as well as Ephesians 4, Paul regards miraculous endowments as belonging to the infancy of the church, and as no longer needed when the church should come to maturity.

The passage quoted from Isaiah, even if allowed the universal application which our querist gives it, would not prove what he seeks to prove by it. But, in fact, it was a special promise *to the Jews,* relative to a special time, as may be seen from Paul's interpretation of it in Rom. 11:25-27. Nor is it a promise that the Spirit would be given to each generation to teach it *new words,* or make *new revelations,* but the words originally taught to the first generation to which this promise was to be fulfilled—*the same words* were to continue to be taught to all generations. This is a very different thing from a new set of apostles and prophets with a new set of revelations for each succeeding generation.

The supernatural gifts of the first age were necessary only until the whole truth of the gospel was made known and confirmed. Infant churches without a knowledge or means of knowledge of the will of God, except as given by inspiration, needed inspired teachers, apostles, evangelists, prophets, etc. But when the whole will of God was made known, they were needed no longer; for the saints could be prepared for every work of ministry by the word of God, and it was only necessary that the word which had been given by inspiration should be put into the mouth of each succeeding generation henceforth and forever.

To say that we can not return to the simplicity,

unity, purity and spirituality of the primitive churches without a renewal of miracles and inspired teachers, is like saying that a man can not return to the artlessness and docility of childhood without becoming a suckling and returning to swaddling-clothes. The church is surely not less the church of Christ because it has outgrown and put away childish things.

Apostolic Succession. Will you please give me in your "Querists' Drawer," briefly, the argument against apostolic succession? Also, since "Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given," why laying on of hands is not necessary now? C. A. R.

1. The arguments are Biblical and historical. Of the Biblical argument, it may be said (1) that there is no mention of succession; (2) that the apostolical authority of the original apostles has never ceased; (3) that the *qualifications* of an apostle (Acts 1:21, 22; 1 Cor. 9:1), and the *signs* of an apostle (2 Cor. 12:12), are wanting in the so-called successors; that they were special and extraordinary gifts to the church for a limited time (Eph. 4:11-13). Historically, the argument is that no such succession can be made out.

2. Because the Holy Spirit is not to be given in any such miraculous way, and there is none authorized to lay on hands for any such purpose.

Ark, Noah's. I wish to know the true estimate of Noah's ark, with its contents, its size, etc.

Three hundred cubits long, 50 cubits broad and 30 cubits high give a ground surface of 15,000 cubits square, and a cubical content of 450,000 cubits solid. The cubit is supposed to have been about eighteen inches. As the ark was built for floating, and not for sailing, it was simply a box, without keel, and probably with a flat deck. It would, in this shape, carry a cargo

greater by one-third than any other form of like cubical content. We subjoin a note from Lange's "Genesis," by Taylor Lewis:

"The difficulty which some have in respect to the magnitude of the ark, and the greatness of the work, arises from overlooking the extreme simplicity of the structure, the length of time allowed, the physical constitution of the fabricators, and the facilities for obtaining the materials, which, it is easy to suppose, may have existed in abundance in their near vicinity. From men of primitive gigantic strength, to whom the architects of Stonehenge, the raisers of Cyclopean walls (structures found in Greece and in other parts of Europe, which, to our modern eyes, seem almost superhuman), the lifters and drawers of the immense stones of the pyramids, and the diggers of the deep granite caverns of Upper Egypt, were junior and inferior—four such men (to say nothing of any other probable help), with iron tools—simple, perhaps, yet well adapted to cutting, splitting and hewing (see Gen. 4:22)—and surrounded by forests of the gopher-pine, firm and durable, yet light and easy for working, could certainly have built such an ark in much less time than is allowed for it in the Scriptures. It is nothing incredible, nothing even strange, that they should have laid such a flooring—three hundred cubits long and fifty wide—and that they should have raised upon it walls and a roof thirty cubits high; that they should have strengthened the whole with wedges, spikes and girding-timbers, making it a large drydock rather than a ship, and then have rendered it watertight by a copious use of the rosin and bitumen that abounded in that region."

Let us add that the number of animals taken into the ark depends on the extent of the deluge. If it was con-

fined to the basin of the Euphrates and Tigris, while it must have swept away the then existing human race, it required provision for only a comparatively small number of animals. We have not space for this discussion here. The reader will find in "Murphy on Genesis" a careful and learned consideration of this question.

Will you please inform me through the STANDARD, how long Noah was in building the ark? I make this inquiry because I believe you to be as competent to answer this query as any one I know. T. H. TAYLOR, P. M.

MARKSVILLE, Page Co., Va.

Our querist can safely award us this credit without flattery; for the fact is, nobody knows. It is *inferred* from Gen. 6:3 that one hundred and twenty years were to be granted to man for repentance before the flood, and that during this time the ark was built. This, however, is a mere inference. When the events of sixteen hundred years are crowded into seven brief chapters, there is no room for curious details.

Assessments, Church. I lately heard an elder instruct his congregation to the end that those who did not pay to support the minister as assessed by the church officers, were cheating the Lord. And that he had observed that those who thus cheat the Lord are always followed by some temporal calamity or misfortune, such as the loss of a cow or a horse, or a bad bargain in some way that would cause them to lose as much, and in many cases twice the amount withheld from the Lord.

If the above is your experience, show wherein a man is cheating the Lord any more in refusing to pay his church obligations than he is in refusing to pay any other debt deliberately and fairly made. C. G. FAIT.

Never having "cheated the Lord" in any such way, to our knowledge, we are unable to say that "such is our experience." We have had some pretty hard knocks of misfortune sometimes, but we never attributed them

to sinning in that particular. We always religiously pay our assessment, unless we can convince those in authority that they have assessed us unjustly. We hold ourselves bound to pay our share of the lawful outlays of the church of which we are a member—just as much bound, and no more—as to pay any other debt deliberately and fairly made. How far calamity comes on those who fail, we are not prepared to say; but as far as our observation extends, not far enough nor fast enough to bring them to repentance.

We would hesitate to say, in all cases, that those who refuse to pay their assessments are cheating the Lord. But where a church agrees to raise its funds in that way, even if we think it is not the best way, it is better to yield to the general wish and defer to our brethren in a matter of expediency, than to be stubborn and rebellious about it. Time and experience will generally bring a church right in such matters.

Assurance, How Maintained. Six years ago I united with the church of Christ, by rendering a cheerful obedience to the requirements of the gospel.

I *enjoyed* my Christian calling for a period of three or four years, and endeavored as best I could to maintain its character inviolate. My spiritual condition *now* is vastly different. I am sad, discouraged, despondent, dissatisfied! My faith and zeal have diminished; I doubt, falter, stumble and fear I shall fall! My spiritual vision is obscured. I give thanks at table, and try earnestly to pray for relief, but they are as so many empty words, and go no higher than my head. I commune and attend to the ordinances, but I fear that in all these I am hypocritical—am too corrupt and sinful to attend to any spiritual duty. I can observe the *form*, but the spirit, the heart-work, is lacking, and my soul is not satisfied. The longings of my soul are for a closer walk with God. I want to converse with him, *receive his smiles and approval,* and *know that he is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him.* I want to *realize his presence* and constant watch-care, as I do that of an earthly parent. I attend

every meeting of the church and Sunday-school, and (aside from my avocation) confine myself *chiefly* to religious associations. My literature, *too,* is, in the main, Christian; yet, with all this, I retrograde. In my darkest hour I am almost constrained to cry out in despair, *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani.* I perceive that as my faith decreases, my hope of heaven and dread of hell diminishes correspondingly. I hold the office of deacon, and it is made a part of my duty to pass the emblems to the disciples, and thereby my responsibilities are increased.

I have a little one whom I should rear in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. How can I discharge my duties as husband and parent, in my present condition? I advised with my former pastor and *now* I appeal to you for advice. If there remains a hope of my recovery, I seek the remedy in tears. My ultimate destiny must and will be decided soon, as a neutral or standing-still position is out of the question; I must go forward or backward—the latter seems inevitable. Shall I resign my office and peaceably withdraw from the church? Unless it be the following, I know not the *cause of my delinquency.* The carnality of the church—introduction of instrumental music into its worship (against the will of a minority)—choir music—dispensing with the worship at the regular hour for a concert, or children's meeting—indifference of the membership in regard to the ordinances, prayer-meeting, etc. These all give me pain; but should they legitimately produce the effect above described?

WANDERER.

We would not have published the foregoing statement were we not confident that it represents with more or less faithfulness the spiritual condition of a considerable class in the church—a class of noble, suffering natures who suffer exquisitely for years in silence, afraid to speak of their real state of mind. No one cause can be assigned that will cover all these cases. The origin of their troubles is various. We can only point out some of the principal sources of their embarrassments, and make such suggestions as may help them to a better understanding of themselves.

1. In many cases the source of the trouble is physical,

not spiritual. It is occasioned by a bad stomach, a diseased liver, or some other physical derangement which shrouds the mental nature in gloom and occasions utter morbidness. Our first inquiry in all such cases would be as to the condition of the physical man. The doctor is often needed more than the preacher. Therapeutic and hygienic treatment is needed much more than sermons or homilies. The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, and heavenly light and peace are only fully realized when that temple is carefully kept clean and in good repair.

2. It comes from the excess of ideality and extreme sensitiveness of conscience. In such cases, no difference how pure the person nor how rapid and permanent his growth to religious life, his *ideal* Christian life and enjoyment is so far in advance of the real that it must always seem to him as if a certain falseness clings to him in his profession. He would be perfect in thought, word and deed. The least deviation from this seems a terrible deformity. He would step from mountain-top to mountain-top in grand and heroic strides heavenward; and, instead, his steps are short and sluggish, and he sometimes stumbles and flounders in the dust. He would live in a perpetual transport—his being constantly thrilled with the conscious presence of the Spirit, and his soul ever jubilant in its experiences; he would dwell perpetually on the mount of transfiguration; but he is compelled to cry, "Woe is me, that I sojourn in Meshech, and dwell in the tents of Kedar."

In such cases, men must learn to know themselves—to understand their own peculiarities of constitution and temperament—and then they will cause their ideality and conscientiousness alike to serve as a spur to better attainments, and not as a hindrance or discouragement. Every

man should endeavor to understand himself, to know his own peculiarities, to ascertain what powers are in excess of development and what faculties are feeble, that he may repress the former and strengthen the latter. It requires much self-knowledge and skill and patience to key this "harp of a thousand strings," so that it will be free from discords, respond to every touch in sweet and healthful tones, and make life's anthem a grand succession of melodies and harmonies, rounding into exultant strains of joy—a magnificent "chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies." But it is worth all it costs to succeed.

3. With many it is the awakening out of the blind trust of infancy—the fearful period of doubt and struggle which every thoughtful nature is compelled to reach. In spiritual as in physical infancy there is much of glad and exultant life which is more instinctive than rational. It serves its purpose, but it can not always last. It gives way to the reign of reason, and the unthinking joyousness of infancy is succeeded by the poignant anguish of doubt, and peace is parted with until it is recovered as the result of thorough conviction and settled on the foundation of actual experience. We wake up to find that there are doubts about much that we believe; that there are many plausible objections to be urged against it; that there are a thousand suggestions of difficulty, contradiction, mystery, failure, etc., in the faith we have cherished. It is a terrible awakening—especially in this age of bold advance in materialistic science, when these doubts come sweeping over us in gales and tempests, lashing our once peaceful sea of life into uproar and threatening to wreck our confidence and our hopes. Yet this is the price of the possession of an intellectual and spiritual nature—of that self-sovereignty which can only

be worthily asserted by such as have convictions of their own, formed in the face of doubts and oppositions. There are no limits to the doubts that may arise. It is said of the celebrated Bristol preacher, F. W. Robertson, that he was so swept away by doubt at one time that he had but one article remaining in his creed; namely, "It is always right to do right." He clung to this as the only plank left him in the ocean to save him from drowning. Out of the depths of almost utter despair he rose at last to be such a preacher of life and salvation to others as he never could have been but for his own rugged and awful experiences.

It wants great care and courage to pass through this perilous period safely. For a time we are certain of nothing, and are in constant danger of wrecking our ship in stormy and treacherous seas—especially if we fail to detect the false lights that wreckers hang out along the coast on purpose to bewilder us and draw us into false harbors. It is best, under such circumstances, to seek the counsel of experienced Christians and to allow competent teachers to guide our readings. It is well, too, to cherish such reflections as the following:

Thousands of noble souls have passed through all these struggles and have reached a settled faith and certain peace. Let me not despair; I am but repeating their experience.

A faith that has been thus tried and tested in myriads of personal experiences, as well as by every species of opposition from without, and still flourishes, can not be fundamentally false, nor can it possibly be unworthy of my trust.

If there is doubt about this, so also is there doubt about everything else. I can not lift myself one degree above the plane of animal life without the possibility of

being assailed with doubts. I can not, therefore, resign, on account of present doubts, a faith which can be supplanted by nothing more certain than itself.

Many objections to Christianity that once were thought unanswerable have been effectually silenced. It is reasonable to conclude that those which now seem most formidable will also give way after fuller investigation.

Whatever may be supposed to prove true at last, everything is gained and nothing lost by holding on to Christ. Atheism, deism, spiritualism, or anything else, proving true, I am not a loser by being a Christian. On the other hand, Christianity proving true, I am saved from loss by clinging to it. It is all gain and no loss on one side; all loss and no gain on the other. Why abandon a rock for quicksands?

We suggest these merely as refuges for the tempest-tossed soul, to shelter him until he is able to trim his vessel and outride the storm. Where there is a heart loyal to truth and virtue, this season of peril will be passed in safety, and be succeeded by a peace and joy richer, because deeper and better founded than any that belonged to earlier life.

4. This paralysis of faith and hope is sometimes attributable to disappointments and trials. Trials do not always make us better. They sometimes paralyze us. It was so in the case of Robertson, already referred to. We lose faith in men, and this undermines our faith in God. We are disappointed in our expectations of spiritual good; afflictions come when we think we do not deserve them, and they come in terrible and remorseless succession, until we cry out, "Doth God know? Doth he consider? Who will show us any good?" In such cases there are three things we should do: (1) Read the

Book of Job carefully and repeatedly. (2) Give close attention to the sorrows and sufferings of our Lord's life. (3) Go out of ourselves in diligent labors for the good of others, refusing to brood over our own troubles, and filling the heart with the woes and wants of others until we work ourselves out of the discouragement. Even John the Baptist, in prison and without employment, and brooding in darkness, began to doubt. It does not do to brood over this class of troubles. Get out into the sunshine. Get to work. Cease all agitation of the subject, and sooner or later your own experience will set you right, the clouds will disappear, and all will be bright again.

We advise our correspondent to study his case in the light of these suggestions, and determine on his remedy. Meanwhile, let him hold on to duty, in spite of doubts and darkness, and patiently wait for the solution of his difficulties. We can not advise him to hold the office of deacon, if he finds himself haunted with a consciousness of falseness in his position; but let him hold on to Christ, to his word, to prayer, to a pure life, and to activity in doing good to others; and although he may know no sudden deliverance, he will gradually overcome the insensibility of which he complains, and emerge from the thick darkness that surrounds him.

These are not always our least profitable experiences. Dark and painful as they are, when we come forth from them we are the richer and stronger for it. There is a thousand times more to rejoice in, in such cases as this, than in the undisturbed complacency of the self-righteous.

Authority of Church of England. 1. An intelligent Episcopalian told me to-day that it was claimed with (as he thought) good authority, that a lady, a convert of Paul (the

apostle), went over to England and organized the Church of England, from which the Episcopalian Church originated. Is there any good authority for it? and what gave rise to the assertion?

2. In the Dark Ages, was there any other than the Church of Rome of the Christian religion? JAS. W. RESPESS.

ENGELHARD, N. C.

1. There are various stories, having their rise in later centuries, as to the preaching of the gospel in Britain in the apostolic age; such as that Paul himself carried the gospel thither; and, again, that Joseph of Arimathea and twelve other persons were sent by the apostle Philip —he having taken upon himself the instruction of the Franks—and that these preachers sent into Britain made many converts and laid the foundation of the church at Glastonbury. But, as Mosheim says, this was a story of the monks, in support of which they could advance no sort of authority whatever. If there was a church planted there in the first century, it failed to survive. The story to which our querist refers has a different origin. In 2 Tim. 4:21 there is mention made of *Pudens* and *Claudia*. There are two epigrams of Martial, written in the first century of the Christian era, in one of which the marriage of a distinguished Roman named *Pudens* to a foreign lady named *Claudia* is described; and in the other we are told that this Claudia was a Briton. The story grows out of an attempt to identify the Pudens and Claudia of Martial with the Pudens and Claudia of Paul—as they all belong to Rome and to the first century. In Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul," in the notes on 2 Tim. 4:21, will be found a pretty full statement of what is deemed to be corroborative evidence. We must content ourselves, for want of space, with the briefer statement of the Lord Bishop of London, in the "Speaker's Com-

mentary," in his note on 2 Tim. 4:21. He is high-Episcopal authority, and his words ought to have weight:

> It has been thought possible that *Pudens* may be the friend of the poet Martial, whose marriage with Claudia, a foreign lady, he celebrates in Epigram viii., lib. iv., supposing that other epigrams which are not favorable to the moral character of Pudens, were written before his conversion. An inscription found at Colchester mentions a site given by one Pudens for a temple built under the sanction of a British king, Claudius Coigdubnus; and it has been conjectured that this was the same Pudens who was a centurion in the army, and who may have married the daughter of Coigdubnus, whose name would consequently have been Claudia. The Claudia Rufina of Martial was a Briton (xi. 53), and may have received the name of Rufina from Pomponia, the wife of Aulus Plautius, commander in Britain, who was connected with the Rufi family, and was accused of holding foreign superstitions. *All this, however, is very uncertain.*

The Lord Bishop may well call it "*very* uncertain," in view of the *conjectures* on which the story is based, and the *maybes* by which the different parts are linked together. It certainly does not belong to *history*.

According to Tertullian, Britain was brought under the power of the gospel towards the end of the second century; and the gospel did not come, in the first place, from Italy, but probably from the East through south Gaul, and afterwards from Italy also.

2. In the Dark Ages, there was no Church of England separate from Rome. There were, all through the ages, dissenters from the Church of Rome and protestors against her corruptions of doctrine and of practice, known at different times and places under various names, but with more or less clearness holding to the teaching of the word of God in opposition to the teachings of the Church of Rome.

Babylon Deserted. 1. Can man live where Babylon stood?

Yes. It is shunned, however, to this day, by the natives, as a haunted place; the Arab will not pitch his tent nor the shepherd fold his sheep there. The prophecy of Isaiah (chap. 13) has been fulfilled.

Baptism a Command. Some contend there are two baptisms—one of the Holy Spirit, the other with water. How is it?

There are several baptisms spoken of in the Scriptures—baptism in fire, baptism in water, baptism in the Spirit, baptism in sufferings, baptism into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea. But when we speak of the baptism which is *commanded,* and in which we are to *obey* the authority of the Lord Jesus, it is water baptism. See Acts 10:47, 48. No one was ever *commanded* to be baptized in the Holy Spirit, and, if he were, it would be impossible to *obey.* Baptism in the Spirit was *promised* to certain persons (Acts 1:5); baptism in fire was *threatened* against certain persons (Matt. 3:11, 12); baptism in water is *commanded* of all who believe (Acts 10:48; 2:38). This is the only baptism in which we *obey* the command to be baptized. While there are "lords many," to us there is but "one Lord"—Jesus Christ. While there are faiths many, to us there is but "one faith"—faith in the Son of God. While there are baptisms many, to us there is but "one baptism"—baptism in water, "in the name of the Lord," and "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Baptism a Seal and Sign. What would be proper to say to one who claims that "baptism is a *sign* and *seal* of the forgiveness of sins, or a *sign* and *seal* of the New Covenant"?

Is baptism a sign or a seal? Circumcision is called such, but is Christian baptism?

Baptism is never called in the Scriptures a sign or a seal. From certain points of view it may be regarded as one or the other, but it is best to refuse to accept of unauthorized words to designate its character or office —especially as the Holy Spirit is called the seal. See Eph. 1:13; 4:30; 2 Cor. 1:22.

Baptism, A Second. I made a profession of religion when at the age of fourteen. I presume I was old enough to understand the Scriptures, but I did not understand them as I do now. I did not think of joining until requested by my father, who had just gone forward, and I went forward and confessed, etc., more to please him than anything else, and now I often wish I had not started until I more fully understood the Scriptures.

1. I think sometimes of going to some place where I am not known, and go to some minister of the gospel, and relate my circumstances to him and be baptized; and if I did so, would I have to get a letter from that organization?

2. I think of relating my trouble to the minister that preaches here every two weeks, and have him give an invitation for any one that is not satisfied with their conversion to come forward and confess the name of Jesus, and be baptized for the remission of their sins, and then I will go forward and obey. I will be glad to have this explained, that I may know what to do, so that when Christ comes to take up his jewels I will not be lost, for I want to be numbered with the righteous.

ONE OF YOUR CONSTANT READERS.

1. The fact that you did not understand the Scriptures as clearly as you do now, is not a good reason for rebaptism. It is certain, if you continue to search the Scriptures, you will understand many things more clearly and fully five years hence than you do now, and there might be as good reason for a third baptism then as a second baptism now. What the Scriptures require in order to baptism is "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Not *complete* faith, either, but *genuine* faith, though it may be only as a

grain of mustard seed. Did you trust in Jesus for salvation? Did you put away your sins and begin a new life? If so, your baptism was proper and acceptable to God. If you did not believe and repent, it was not Christian baptism at all; you are yet unbaptized. If the latter supposition is true, and after full deliberation and consultation with wise Christians you decide that you were destitute of faith and repentance, the best way is to go before the church and state the case frankly and fully, and ask, not to be *re*baptized, but to be baptized—because, in the absence of faith and repentance, there is no Scriptural baptism.

But you must have better grounds for your request than that you understand the Scriptures better now than you did then; for this is simply an evidence of spiritual growth from infancy towards manhood.

Baptism by One Spirit. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body."

Does this allude to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or water baptism? Is it among the spiritual gifts? Was it the baptism of the Holy Spirit that brought Jews and Gentiles into one body, or water baptism?

Our views of this text are by no means settled. We are not sure that it refers to the Holy Spirit at all. It is adduced as an argument for *unity* among the disciples; that much is clear. It refers to a fact of which they were all presumed to be cognizant—that they had been, in or by one Spirit, baptized into one body, and had all been made to drink into one Spirit. But precisely the fact to which reference is made, we are not so certain about.

If we retain the common rendering of *en,* which some scholars insist on, and say, *by* one Spirit, then it is not an immersion *in* the Spirit, but *by* the Spirit. The

Spirit was not the element *in* which they were baptized, but the power or authority *by* which they were baptized; and the reference is to water baptism. But if we translate *en* by *in,* as we incline to think is preferable here, then Spirit represents the element *in* which they were baptized; and the reference is either to the baptism in the Spirit by which Jews and Gentiles were made equally admissible into the one body, or to a baptism in the Spirit which goes along with baptism in water in every case of true baptism—which is a view that has some supporters among us—or to their baptism as being in one Spirit of trust in and obedience to our common Lord.

Taking the passage in connection with the general teaching of the New Testament concerning baptism, we incline to regard the baptism as water baptism, for this reason: That baptism alone can be regarded as properly initiatory. It is in water baptism that the believer is baptized *into* the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; *into* Jesus Christ; *into* his death, etc.; and therefore *into* the one body. But the admission of Jews and Gentiles, and all classes of these, through the one baptism into the one body, was the result of the baptism in the Spirit of Jews and Gentiles (Acts 2 and 10). Hence it was *by* the one Spirit, or, if you prefer, *in* the one Spirit, that they were all authorized and empowered to be baptized in water into one body, and were all made partakers of the same Spirit. That is as near as we can get to a satisfactory answer.

Baptism in Spirit and in Fire. Matt. 3:11: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit, and in fire," etc. John was baptizing in Jordan. Many of the Pharisees and Sadducees

came to him, demanding baptism—their presence called forth the severe but just language with which John rebuked them, and furnished the occasion for the words of the eleventh verse cited above.

1. Does John mean, "He shall baptize you [who obey him] in the Holy Spirit, and you [who disobey him] in fire?" (*a*) Then, if this be true, is not every one who obeys the gospel, baptized in the Holy Spirit now? And (*b*) is not the reception of the Holy Spirit properly and Scripturally called a baptism of the Holy Spirit? It must not be limited in that case to the miraculous exhibitions of power witnessed on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius?

2. Does this language refer to the Jews only, and does the baptism of fire find its complete fulfillment in the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Jewish temple and polity? L. A. C.

While the language in Matt. 3:11 does not distinctly mark two baptisms, we are constrained to interpret the language as referring to two distinct baptisms, by the following considerations: 1. He had two classes before him—the penitent and the impenitent—and verses 10 and 12 unmistakably identify the impenitent as the subjects of a baptism in fire. Having used fire as a symbol of divine judgments in both these verses, it is not probable that between them, in close proximity, and in almost the same breath, he would give another and opposite metaphorical meaning to the same word. 2. The last prophet of the old dispensation connected a baptism in fire and "a great and dreadful day of the Lord" with the coming of John the Baptist, or rather makes him the herald of that day (Mal. 4; comp. with Matt. 11:14; 17:12, 13; Luke 1:17). 3. The baptism in fire is mentioned only when the wicked class is mentioned, as in Matt. 3 and Luke 3; while in Mark (1:8), Acts (1:5) and John (1:33), where this wicked class is not brought into view, the baptism in fire is not mentioned.

(*a*) Not necessarily, any more than that those who

disobey are baptized in fire now. See Joel 3:28-32, where the baptism in the Spirit and the "great and terrible day of the Lord" are clearly marked as coetaneous and alike extraordinary.

(*b*) So many think, but we are not convinced of it. The prophecy of Joel and the only two instances (Acts 2 and 10) in which the New Testament speaks of baptism in the Holy Spirit, not only mention the results of it as miraculous, but *confine* these results to the miraculous. To call that a baptism in the Spirit which lacks, in its results, the main, if not the only, feature of that baptism, is, in our view, altogether unwarrantable.

2. The baptism in the Holy Spirit does not refer to Jews only, for Joel prophesied, "I will pour out my Spirit *on all flesh*"—Gentile as well as Jew. But John, we presume, speaking to Jews only, spoke of it only as it related to them, as it is to us quite certain that his language concerning the baptism in fire was limited, in its application, to the Jews. "He will thoroughly purge *his floor*." The threshing-floor was Jerusalem and Palestine. We think the baptism in fire found its complete fulfillment in the calamities that came upon that people, resulting in the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish temple and polity. As the *principles* of God's moral government are ever the same, there is no violence done in applying them to God's dealings with the righteous and wicked in all ages; but beyond this we do not think we are warranted in extending the application of John's language beyond the people and the age to whom and in which he spoke.

Baptism, John's, Not Sufficient After Pentecost. It is in behalf of another person that I take the liberty of addressing you.

There is a man in this valley that has been trying to study

out why it was that those twelve men spoken of in the nineteenth chapter of Acts were rebaptized, and that, after they were baptized, Paul laid his hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit.

The query in his mind is, why were those twelve rebaptized, and why did Paul have to lay his hands upon them before the Holy Spirit was given, those twelve only of all John baptized?

From some cause not known to us, these persons had heard of John's preaching, and had been baptized in the expectation of a Messiah to come; and had afterwards been shut out from information concerning the mission of Christ, the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the entrance of the Lord Jesus on his reign. Adam Clarke conjectures that they were Asiatic Jews, who, having been at Jerusalem about twenty-six years before this, had heard the preaching of John, received his baptism, and, returning home, had never learned any more on the subject. To us it is more probable that under the instruction of some such teacher as Apollos (see chap. 18:25) they had received John's baptism—a baptism in the faith of a coming Saviour—after the kingdom of Christ had become a realized fact, and the preparatory mission of John had no longer authority. That which was orderly and proper during the preparatory ministry of John was no longer orderly and proper after the authority of Christ was fully revealed and established. They were therefore baptized now *in the name of the Lord Jesus,* accepting an authority which they now recognized as present and real, and accepting the blessings of his reign, which they had hitherto regarded merely as prospective.

Of course, as they had not been instructed concerning the Holy Ghost, they had not looked for any such blessings. But now, being taught that Jesus had entered on his reign, and that what John had only promised was

now realized, they were baptized in expectation of the reception of spiritual powers.

The impartation of the Spirit through the laying on of hands, points to the bestowal of supernatural gifts. It does not necessarily exclude the idea of the "Spirit of adoption;" there may have been no chronological difference in the reception of these. Still it remains true that, had nothing more been intended than the impartation of the Spirit of adoption—the sending forth the Spirit of God's Son into their hearts (Gal. 4:6)—there was no need for the laying on of hands. That was the method of imparting miraculous gifts. See Acts 8:14-20, from which it is evident that the miracle-working power was what excited the cupidity of Simon Magus. See also Acts 9:17; Rom. 1:11. From the latter it is evident that the apostles were empowered to impart "spiritual gifts" (for the meaning of which see 1 Cor. 12), and the other text shows that this was done by the laying on of hands.

Baptism, Roman Catholic View of.

A querist who signs himself "G," in your issue of this date, asks for the "Catholic authority" for immersion as the primitive and long-continued practice of the church in the act of baptism, and that the church changed it to sprinkling or pouring. In answer you say, "You are not aware that the Roman Catholic Church has spoken authoritatively on the question." It is of some importance that the facts should be known.

"The Holy Bible, according to the Douay & Rheimish versions, with the complete notes of the Rev. Geo. Leo Haydock, New York; Edward Dunnigan & Brother, 151 Fulton St., near Broadway, publishers. James B. Kirker, 371 Broadway, 1851 (unabridged), endorsed by

the Pope, Pius IX., at Rome; Cardinal Wiseman, of Westminster; Bellini, apostolic nuncio at Rome, and all the Catholic archbishops and bishops in the United States and British America and Canada." This work bears more evidence of authority than any Catholic work ever published in this country, designed both for Catholics and Protestants, and is a most valuable work for the scholarship and care with which it has been prepared. I think the price was $15.

I transcribe the note on Matt. 3:6:

NOTE.—"The word 'baptism' signifies a washing, particularly when it is done by immersion, or by dipping, or plunging a thing under water, which was formerly the ordinary way of administering the sacrament of baptism. But the church which can not change the least article of the Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremonies. Not only the Catholic Church, but also the pretended reformed churches, have altered this primitive custom in giving the sacrament of baptism, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water on the person baptized; nay, many of their ministers do it nowadays by filliping a wet finger and thumb over the child's head, or by shaking a wet finger over the child, which it is hard enough to call a baptizing in any sense." Also see note on Mark 1:9: "That Christ was baptized by immersion, is clear from the text, 'For he who ascended out of the water, must first have descended into it.' And this method was in general use in the church for thirteen hundred years, as appears from the acts of councils and ancient rituals."

The above clear and explicit testimony, coming as it does from such an authoritative source, can not fail to be regarded by all who value human history on such matters as of the highest importance. To those who do

not regard human history, it can not fail to have importance in confirming the divine record.

Baptism, Virtue of. Do you understand, in Acts 2:48, that *baptism* has the same virtue and power for the remission of sins as *repentance?* WM. FAUCHBOWER, Jr.
SCHOOLCRAFT, Mich.

Nothing, on the human side, has *virtue* or *power* for the remission of sins. All the virtue and power are in the grace of God, revealed in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, the Christ, confirmed by the Holy Spirit, and communicated to us in the gospel. Forgiveness is a sovereign act of God, and not a change wrought in us. Faith, repentance and baptism are *means of appropriating* what the grace of God freely offers to us through the death of Jesus. They are conditions adapted to our nature, graciously established in view of their power to fit us for the enjoyment of forgiveness and to assure us of it as a definite and settled fact. No one of them has the same virtue or power as the other—no one can be substituted for another. Baptism can not be substituted for faith, nor repentance for baptism. Faith takes hold of mind and heart, repentance of the will, and baptism consecrates the body and the life to that which the heart has accepted and the will dictates. Baptism can not purify the heart. Faith alone can not consecrate the life to God's service according to the will of God. *In point of authority,* faith, repentance and baptism are equal.

Baptism, When Valid. If a person has been baptized *because of,* instead of *for,* the remission of sins, and is afterwards led to believe the latter, is his baptism sufficient without his being again immersed?

We doubt if this is a fair statement of the supposed case. A person may be baptized, thinking that his sins

were previously forgiven; but to be baptized *because* his sins are forgiven, is another thing. If he was baptized *because* the Lord Jesus required it, and *because* he would thus show forth his obedience to divine authority—and this, we think, would cover most of the cases contemplated by our correspondent—then, in our judgment, his mistake as to the design of baptism would not invalidate his obedience. The true *motive* to obedience existed—faith in Jesus; the true *act* was performed in obedience to divine authority. Because he wakes up, sometime afterward, to the discovery that the ordinance contained a richer blessing than he knew of when he honored it, it surely does not follow that he must repudiate his faith in Christ and his obedience to him.

Baptisms, Doctrine of. Will you explain Heb. 6:2: "Of the doctrine of baptisms [*baptismon;* plural], and of laying on of hands," etc.

This ("baptisms") is given as the third elementary principle of the religion of Christ.

Why does Paul speak of baptisms in the plural number? And how are we to reconcile this with what he says in Eph. 4:5: "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism"?

Is there a plurality of baptisms under the reign of Christ, and which may therefore be classed with the rudiments of the doctrine of Christ? If so, what are they?

WESTON, Ill. H. D. LEDGERWOOD.

It depends on what is settled to be the meaning of "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," or, rather, "the word of the beginning of Christ," in verse 1. If this refers to what was taught in the law, the rudimentary forms of Christian doctrine, and which had been the basis of gospel preaching to the Jews, then "baptisms," with all the other items, refers to the baptisms under the Jewish economy, and perhaps also to the baptism of John, as included in "the word of the beginning of

Christ." We are inclined to this view. The Epistle was written to Hebrews. The basis of their instruction in the gospel was their own Scriptures. Repentance, baptisms, or purifications, laying on of hands, or sanctifications, the resurrection and the judgment, they had learned of in their own Scriptures, and from this, as a starting-point, the apostles had led them along to the fuller knowledge of these things as presented in the gospel. They were disposed to linger among those rudimentary teachings of their own law; or, under the pressure of Judaizing teaching, to go back to these and content themselves with them. That this was what Paul meant seems further evident from the first word in verse 4: *for,* if you go back to lay again these old foundations, and rest there, there is no hope for you.

Bapto vs. Baptizo. In an article written by F. L. Patton, D. D., in a book called "Preparing to Teach," issued by the Presbyterian Board of Philadelphia, occurs the following idea relating to baptism:

"That the use of the words *bapto* and *baptizo* does not warrant *immersion.* These words are used where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have been 'wet with the dews of heaven,' and where washing of the hands, of pots and cups is spoken of." This seems weak to me. Can you oblige me by demonstrating briefly that it is so. I wish to have a clear refutation handy, as an antidote to the error. W. H. S.

1. *Baptizo* is not used in Dan. 4:33, but *bapto,* of which *baptizo* is a derivative. Professor Stuart says on these words: "Whilst *bapto* sometimes means to stain, to color, *baptizo* is not so used—has no such meaning; also, *baptizo* is used to designate the Christian ordinance, whilst *bapto* is never so used." But the Presbyterian gentleman may find a passage in the Old Testament in which *baptizo* is used, in the Septuagint. See 2 Kings 5:14: "Then went he down and *dipped* [*ebaptisato*] him-

self seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God." He had been told to go and *wash* seven times in Jordan, and this he did by *dipping* (baptizing) himself seven times in that river.

2. The following extract from John G. Fee's excellent treatise on baptism contains all that need be said on the meaning of *bapto* in Daniel:

> 1. As we are informed, dews, where Nebuchadnezzar was, fell not gently, but most profusely, almost like rain; and this was the occasion of the metaphor, the word being used as we often use the word *duck,* when, after passing through a heavy shower, we say, "I caught a complete ducking," the action being put for the drenching effect the action produces. Milton, referring to the event, expresses the figure more beautifully when he makes Nebuchadnezzar exclaim:
>
> "A cold, shuddering dew *dips* me all over."
>
> 2. "Wet" is not an inspired translation: Submerged, his body submerged, drenched with the dews of heaven, would be far more in harmony with the facts in the case and the well-known import of the word, which is to put within, rather than sprinkle upon.

Let us add that this is simply a figurative use of the word, in which the effect is put for the cause. He was as thoroughly drenched with the dews as if he had been baptized or dipped in water. This sort of reasoning from exceptional cases to a general conclusion is fallacious and deceptive. For instance, Webster gives *wet* and *moisten* as meanings of *dip*. But they are based on exceptional use, and are highly figurative meanings of the word. To take these exceptional uses and meanings and attempt by them to destroy the established meaning of *dip,* would not be regarded as scholarly or sensible.

3. Touching the passage in Mark 7:3, 4, 8; Luke 11:38, we submit the facts as presented in the same

work, by J. G. Fee, called "Christian Baptism," as he has been at much pains to investigate and has given the results of his investigations in few words. We give the substance, not the exact words, of his argument.

In the Jewish *Mishna,* the book of Jewish laws and customs, under the heading *Miqroath,* and in chapter 4, there is a description of the Miqvah or ritual bath. This must be a pool in the earth; or, if a tank or baptistery, it must be filled with running water, and the bath "must not be less than a cubit square, nor less than three and a half cubits deep"—enough for the submerging of the whole person. Then the law says, "Everything that becomes unclean, either man or thing, can not become clean unless dipped in water." Again: "Whenever washing his flesh and washing his garments are mentioned in the law, it does not mean anything else but dip his whole body in the Miqvah." Again: "Every one who takes a bath must dip his whole body at once."

Observe, now, that in Mark 7:3 *nipsontai* is used, and in verse 4 *baptisontai;* yet iur translations have rendered them both by the word *wash,* and thus the English reader is confused. The distinction in the facts calls for a distinction in the words that describe the facts. The Jews eat not at any time without washing the *hands,* but if they have been to the market, and contracted defilement in their contact with others, they do not eat unless they first *immerse* themselves. As Lange says: "There is here an evident progression. At all times the Jews, before eating, washed their hands, but after return from the market, where there was so much danger of coming in contact with unclean men, the bath was used as a washing of the whole body." So Meyer, Grotius, and other eminent authorities. As to the baptism of cups, and other things, see Lev. 11:32; Num. 31:23. The

law in the Mishna is: "He who buys a vessel from a Gentile for eating (table use) either of metal or glass or glazed vessels, although they be new, they must be dipped in a miqvah or well which contains the amount of forty sooh of water." The *tables* spoken of in Mark were the *couches* on which they reclined, or the *beds* on which they reposed. These were all required by Jewish usage to be immersed.

In Luke 11:38, the Pharisee marveled that Jesus, having been in contact with the crowd, and especially with the sick and the defiled, did not immerse himself before eating, as the Jews did when they came from market. Conveniences for such bathing were to be found even in houses of no great rank in cities from early times (2 Sam. 11:2), and much more in the houses of the wealthy in later times.

Believers, Signs Follow. As some controversies have come up in regard to who the believers were that are spoken about in the sixteenth chapter and seventeenth verse of Mark's Gospel, that these signs shall follow them that believe, please tell us who these believers were, and where to find the passages that refer to them. J. W. D.

CANE VALLEY, Ky.

Our own impression is that it had special reference to the apostles, and that the reason for the phrase, "them that believe," is to be found in verses 11-14. The stubborn incredulity of some of them up to that time is what is aimed at in the phrase—intimating that if they continued to be thus incredulous they would not be sustained in their mission by these signs. Although others besides the apostles had afterwards some of these gifts bestowed on them for special purposes, yet, as here spoken of, they were designed to be a confirmation of their apostolical mission. See verse 20. Also, Heb. 2:3, 4; 2 Cor. 12:12.

Bible the Pure Word of God. How can Protestants know for certain that the Bible which they read is the pure word of God?

The question of the *genuineness* of the books of the Bible, as the productions of the authors named, has to be settled in the same way as the genuineness of any other ancient records. There is no space here for a full statement of the evidences on which their genuineness and authenticity rest. It will be well to read Professor Stowe's "Origin and History of the Books of the Bible," and "Hinsdale on the Genuineness and Authenticity of the Four Gospels."

If the point of the question is to determine whether the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to be the keeper of the Scriptures is just, we reply that is only substituting one historical question for another, and we have to take up a historical examination of the claims of that church—a question much more troublesome than that of the genuineness of the Scriptures.

The question of the *inspiration* of the Scriptures rests on their contents. The evidence is internal—in the character of the teaching, and its adaptedness to the nature and the wants of man; the unity of design reaching through so many different books, written ages apart; prophecy and its fulfillment; the supernatural character of Christ, and the evidences of his divinity as the Son of God; and his endorsement of the Jewish Scriptures as from God, and his authorization of the mission of the apostles as his inspired messengers. Were we to answer the question in one word, we would say, CHRIST. If it is possible to rest on anything as the word of God, it is on the life and teaching of Jesus; and his teaching once accepted, all else is clear.

The Church of Rome's saying that the Scriptures are

the word of God, does not settle the question, for we have then to ask, What authority has the Church of Rome to decide this question? and this involves us in an inquiry much more complicated and vexatious than that into the claims of the Scriptures themselves.

Birth of Water and Spirit. Is the birth of water and Spirit spoken of by the Saviour (John 3:5) simultaneous? I have heard it so taught. I have always believed them to be separate births. Please explain, for the benefit of many enquirers.

Is the burial spoken of by Paul in Rom. 6, in connection with baptism, a burial in water or Spirit? T. P. C.

1. It is not two births, but one birth. Nicodemus had been born once—born of the flesh; our Lord taught him that he must be born again—this time of water and of the Spirit. The part performed by the Spirit, however, is not simultaneous with the baptism in water. The Spirit imparts life through the gospel, which is "the law of the Spirit of life;" and the living believer is born of water—that is, enters, by means of baptism, a new state of existence, where the life already possessed may find growth and development.

2. A burial in water. What would it amount to, if one were buried momentarily in the Spirit and then raised out of it again? When baptism in the Spirit is spoken of, the idea of a burial and resurrection is not that which the metaphorical use of the word refers to. The reference is to the abundant, overwhelming, overmastering influences of the Spirit, just as when we speak of being immersed in sorrow or pleasure or debt or care.

Bishops, Plurality in Each Congregation. Will you please give your views upon the following questions, supported by quotations from Scripture?

1. Must every congregation, Scripturally organized, have two or more bishops?

2. If so, are they all to have the same qualifications?

3. Is the duty of each and every bishop the same, and what is that duty?

4. Do the Scriptures give liberty for two, three or four bishops in a congregation to meet together and arrange that one of their number shall give his whole time to taking care of and edifying the congregation, and be paid for it—the remainder of them to be exempted from feeding and overseeing the flock?

5. If two or more bishops do jointly oversee and feed the flock, should they each and all receive remuneration, or only one of them?

6. If the two or more bishops do not jointly oversee and feed the flock, do they not lay aside the doctrine and instructions of Scripture and disobey the commands of God in the matter?

A BROTHER.

1. We dare not say they *must*. We can say that the primitive churches, when fully organized, had bishops and deacons, and that to reach the ideal church of the New Testament there should be three or more bishops. But that a church that has no bishops or deacons, may still be a church of Christ, we fully believe—only an imperfect one. And if such a church has material for only one Scriptural bishop and one Scriptural deacon, we do not see that they are less a church with one than with none. Where the "must" comes in is in respect to their qualifications, not in respect to their number. "A bishop *must* be blameless," etc. (1 Tim. 3:2). The number, it strikes us, since the apostles ordained nothing in reference to this point, should be regulated (1) by the material a church possesses, and (2) by its needs. To appoint men without the qualifications which Paul says they *must* have, merely for the sake of a plurality, and that, too, in small churches where one could serve them, has always seemed to us a strangely perverted zeal for Scriptural order.

2. Yes; the same *qualifications,* but not all the same measure of ability, nor the same *gifts.*

3. Their *duties* are the same—to rule and labor in word and doctrine (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 3:5; 5:17; 1 Pet. 5:2). But that these duties may be divided among them, is evident from 1 Tim. 5:17. The same lesson is taught in Rom. 12:7, 8.

4. The Scriptures do not authorize such an arrangement as will *exempt* any from duty, but it is in harmony with the idea of a division of labor above referred to, that any one or more, according to their gifts and the wants of the church, should devote a larger share of time and labor in the office than others. And if one or half a dozen of these should give all their time, or half their time, to the church, thus preventing them from otherwise providing for their families, it is common sense, common honesty, and Scripture, too, that they should be remunerated for their work (1 Tim. 5:17, 18; Gal. 6:6; 1 Cor. 9:7-14).

5. That depends on the amount of time and labor bestowed by them, and this again depends on the size and condition of the church. In some of the apostolic churches, which numbered several thousands, there must have been several employed constantly, and their remuneration would be according to the church's ability and their own needs and labors. A man with a small family, or a grown family, would not need as much as one with a large and growing family; one with means of his own sufficient for a partial support, would not need as much as a very poor man; one with abundant means of his own would not need any. Common sense and justice must be exercised in all cases.

6. Yes. No man has a right to hold a merely nominal office. But this does not necessarily involve equal labor

and care on the part of all. They may delegate to one or more of their number the performance of duties requiring more time and attention than all can bestow; or they may even delegate to other members of the church certain errands of justice or of mercy which said members can more successfully perform than they. *They see that the work is done;* that is the real duty of an overseer.

Blood of Christ for Individuals. I have read your paper occasionally, and find some sound articles; on the whole, I think it is as correct as any of the so-called orthodox papers can be, when we consider how frail a foundation they have to build on. Believing that you are as capable of giving as plausible and ingenious an explanation as any other one who holds the absurd doctrine of everlasting punishment, I take the liberty of asking you to confute (if you can) the following: "The Holy Scriptures do not teach an individual appropriation of the blood of Christ; therefore as Christ shed his blood for all, and as his blood cleanses from all sin, all will be saved, and the doctrine of everlasting punishment is absurd." Please let me hear from you in your paper. ETERNAL SALVATION FOR ALL.

We admit this contrary to our rule, which requires a responsible name to accompany queries. The writer evidently meant it to be a poser, and as it does not relate to personal matters, it will do no harm to override our established regulation.

Because Christ shed his blood for all, it no more follows that all are cleansed by it, than that all are enlightened by his teaching because he is the Light of the world. The sun shines for all, but there has to be "an individual appropriation" of the light; otherwise the sun shines in vain. Do not the Scriptures clearly teach an individual appropriation of the death of Christ? Let us see.

1. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood*" (Rom. 3:25). Faith is an

individual, personal act; and the propitiatory blessings of the blood of Christ are appropriated "through faith."

2. "*If we walk in the light as he is in the light,* we have fellowship one with another, *and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses from all sin*" (1 John 1:7). Here the cleansing power of the blood of Christ is made to depend on an *if*.

3. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were *baptized into his death?*" (Rom. 6:3). Here is "an individual appropriation" of the blood of Christ on the part of believers, in their baptism.

4. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto *obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*" (1 Pet. 1:2). To talk of any being elected unto that which is the same to all, will not do. And to make that depend on *obedience,* which is just the same to the disobedient as to the obedient, is an abuse of language.

Thus endeth the first lesson.

Born of God—Do Not Commit Sin. 1 John 3:9 reads: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he can not sin, because he is born of God."

Are we to understand this in an absolute or modified sense? If in an absolute sense, then a man can not fall from grace. How do you reconcile this Scripture with other passages that read: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us"?

Many persons are anxious to have a full explanation of this (to them) difficult passage. P.

We have several times pointed out that the word *commit* does not fully express the sense of the original, nor do we know how to express it except by circumlocution. Macknight translates, "does not *work* sin;" and this is perhaps better, as the original word denotes work-

ing at a trade or calling. Anderson, we notice, agrees with Macknight in this translation. Sin is not the trade or vocation of the Christian—it is not that at which he works. His *calling* is righteousness, not sin. But in a trade or calling, we may sometimes do bungling work, and sometimes may be tempted aside from our regular work. So with the Christian. He has accepted righteousness as his calling—he works at that. His work may be imperfect; and sometimes he may be drawn away momentarily from it; yet the aim of his life is righteousness, and can be nothing else if he is a child of God. He may, therefore, sin sometimes, and still his *work*—his calling—is righteousness. Hence, the same apostle says, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." And, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father."

Business, The Lord's. Is it right to transact business, or have a discussion, over the Lord's table? Ought not that to be sacred to the commemoration of Christ's death? Where do we find a "thus saith the Lord" for such practice?

WAYNE COUNTY, N. Y. A DISCIPLE.

It is right enough to transact *the Lord's* business on the Lord's Day, if there is need for it. It is in entire harmony with the lessons of the Lord's Supper, to inquire after the sick, the poor, the forsaken, or to bring our offerings to Him who gave all for us, that we may exemplify the unselfishness and mercy taught in His death. But details of business requiring discussion are not generally in harmony with the feelings that belong to that time, but tend to distraction, and should be avoided. "There is a time for everything," and assuredly a funeral occasion is not a time for mirth, nor a wedding feast for mourning, nor the Lord's Supper for discussion.

Campbell, A., a Baptist. I have heard Baptist preachers

assert from the pulpit, that Alexander Campbell was at one time a member of the Baptist Church, and such is the belief of a great number of the members of that church; while on the other hand I have heard preachers of the Disciple Church deny that Mr. Campbell was ever connected with the Baptists in relationship. Information from you in reference to this would be gratifying to A BAPTIST.

Mr. Campbell was immersed by a Baptist minister, and united with the Baptists, the church of which he was a member joining the Redstone Association, stipulating expressly, however, that they "should be allowed to teach and preach whatever they learned from the Holy Scriptures, regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom." There always was, however, a part of the Baptists opposed to him, and they made it so unpleasant for him in the Redstone Association that he left it for the Mahoning Association—which afterwards ceased to be a Baptist association, its churches generally accepting the principles of reformation for which Mr. Campbell contended. See Dr. Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," i., pp. 438-441.

Children and the Kingdom. Jesus says in Matt. 19:14; Mark 10:14, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Are they *in* the kingdom of heaven? and if so, how did they *get* in, and when and how do they get out? If by *transgression,* is it not *possible* for the child to avoid transgression, being brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? And if so, where is the need of baptism in their case? But if not possible, why and where is the sin in doing what we can not avoid? If not *in* the kingdom, what relation do they sustain to the kingdom?

Our Lord does not say that little children are in his kingdom, but *such*—in certain points of comparison—as little children are If our querist will bring forward a child or an adult that has never sinned, he will present

one that Jesus did not come to call to repentance, and one, consequently, that needs neither faith for justification, nor baptism for remission of sins. But, inasmuch as Solomon says that there is not a just man on earth that doeth good and sinneth not, and as all human experience sustains this declaration, it is useless to speculate on the possibility of living without committing a single sin. To say that sin *can* be avoided, is one thing; to say that it *is* avoided, is quite another. We have to deal with what *is,* not with what *might be.*

We do not know that the Scriptures define any particular relation that they sustain to the kingdom.

Children Obeying the Gospel. I. A lad about ten years of age, after hearing the gospel believes it, and expresses a desire to unite with the church, but his mother interposes and says: "My son, I don't think you are old enough to fully understand the import of your action, and prefer to have you postpone this matter a little longer." Heeding the advice of his mother ["children, obey your parents in all things"], he withholds that obedience which is the Saviour's due, and dies.

The mother, ignorantly, but with the purest motives, it is held, advised her son to adopt the course he pursued; the son, believing the gospel, ignorantly disobeyed it. And now the question: Is either one, or both parties, justified? or is the contrary true?

I. (1) It can not be properly said that the child *dis*obeyed the gospel. He simply failed to carry out the desire and purpose of his heart on account of the interposition of the authority under which God had placed him; the execution of his purpose was postponed. The responsibility of the postponement does not rest with the child.

(2) The mother, acting from the purest motives, and simply desiring delay until she could be sure her son was not rashly assuming obligations from impulse rather than

from enlightened and settled convictions, if she erred at all, erred only in judgment. We are not able to say that she erred at all. She had a right to be satisfied that her child was acting intelligently and properly. The fact of his dying does not touch the question of her right to interpose in such a case. If she had known he was to die, it would still have been her duty to interpose to prevent what she deemed rash action on the part of a child whom she did not know to be competent to decide such a question for himself.

If any one thinks God will condemn a mother for doing her best to lead her child aright, or condemn a child ten years of age for failing to accomplish what he purposed on account of respect to his mother's authority, let him have his opinion. We have no such opinion.

What to do in such cases, it is often difficult to determine. We frequently meet with persons who bitterly regret that their parents urged them to a confession of Christ before they were prepared for it. Often, too, young children, from mere impulse, desire to make such confession prematurely. As a rule, however, we are inclined to think that when a child trained in a Christian family voluntarily proposes to give himself to Christ, he ought not to be prevented unless there are clear evidences of a want of proper understanding or proper feeling. Where it is evidently an act of mere impulse, there should be postponement, but not discouragement.

Children, Preaching for. I believe it was Albert Barnes who recommended that at least once every month a sermon should be preached especially to the children and young people. What is your opinion on the subject?

If in favor of it, please give some practical suggestions suitable for young preachers in this part of their work. *

We are decidedly in favor of frequent sermons to

the children. How often must depend on a variety of considerations, and will be variously decided in different places. As a rule, we think once a month will be found good.

1. It should be understood that the services are to have special reference to the children. The hymns, the prayers and the entire service should be adapted to their wants.

2. The sermon should be short—not more than twenty minutes.

3. It should be mostly in monosyllables—plain, simple, strong words that children can understand.

4. It should take up some single point, and enforce it mostly by illustrations drawn from real life. Bible biography and history furnish admirable material. The sacrifice of Isaac, the vision of Samuel, David and Goliath, Peter's denial, Judas' treachery. The birth, baptism, temptation, miracles, trial, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus furnish excellent themes; as also scenes in which children appear. The conversions in the New Testament also give profitable themes.

5. The gospel, in the simplest style, should be preached to them.

6. As many children are already in the church, lessons of Christian duty—truthfulness, kindness, patience, forgiveness, etc.—should be taught.

7. Avoid making fun for the children, and dealing with them as if they know nothing.

8. Question them on the sermon as you would on a lesson. Or, better yet, intersperse the sermon with questions and answers, and make it simply a free consultation with the children.

9. Don't forget to appeal to their *consciences,* and to impress on them their need of salvation.

Children of the Kingdom Cast Out. In Matt. 8:11, 12, who are the children of the kingdom that are cast out? What kingdom is referred to? And when cast out?

Please answer for benefit of our Sunday-school and many others. M. M. SCOTT.

SCOTTSVILLE, Floyd Co., Ind.

It refers clearly to the Jews, who, as God's covenant people, were heirs of the kingdom and entitled first of all to its benefits. Hence it is said again, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." The kingdom of God, in its germ, is found in the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. 12:3; comp. with Gal. 3:8, 16, 17), and in development, in the theocracy of the Jewish nation (Mark 6:26-29).

They were cast out when they rejected the gospel, and the apostles turned to the Gentiles. See Rom. 11:17-22.

Christ's Divinity vs. Deity. Do we not as a church believe and teach, not only the divinity, but the deity, of Jesus Christ, and the immortality of the soul of man? J.

We make no distinction between the *divinity* and *deity* of Jesus. When we teach that Jesus is *divine,* as well as *human,* we assert his *deity* and *humanity.* But we discourage all speculations on these high themes, and insist, whenever we find men disposed to speculate, that they shall adhere closely to Scripture language and give their speculations to the winds.

We wish to say, if any preachers among us are disposed to make a hobby of soul-sleeping, that all our experience warns us that the results are mischievous to the peace and the spirituality of the churches. Good men, when they know this, will hold their speculations in abeyance. Bad men, who will sacrifice the peace of

the churches to their own pride of opinion, should be shunned. The churches should avoid them.

Christ Made a High Priest. 1. When was Christ made a high priest over the house of God?

2. How was he made a high priest?

3. Could he have been a high priest before he ascended to heaven? C. H. A.

1. He was made high priest when "by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). That is, when "he entered into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us" (10:24).

2. He was made high priest by the call of God, not by taking the honor unto himself (Heb. 5:5); and not, as the Aaronic priests, "without an oath, but with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (7:21).

3. He could not. The author of Hebrews says: "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens: a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. . . . If he were on earth he would ever be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law" (Heb. 8:2-5).

Christ, Morality of. Would it be proper to base an argument to prove the divinity of Christ upon his superior morality, since he requires those who are not divine to live as perfect as he? I.

I am not sure that I get the intention of this querist in the foregoing.

The morality of Christ may be said to be a relative proof of his divinity, not an absolute proof. The apostles depended upon three lines of proof of his Messiah-

ship; and if these were sustained, his divinity they considered sustained. These lines of proof were as follows, to-wit: First, his genealogical descent from Abraham through David (see Matthew 1 and Luke 2). Second, the purity of his *doctrine or teaching*. Third, his ability to save all that would put themselves under his guidance or care. That his morality was superior to man, and left all the morality of the teachers of any age that preceded him far in the shade, is evident. But that it would be alone sufficient to prove its author divine, I would not risk affirming. The Book of Nature declares its author divine, when read by the Book of Revelation or the Bible. The mere materialist reader can never find out God. To the eye of sight all that we can see are *effects* of causes more or less remote. To him there can be only two possible conclusions: an *infinite* series of *cause* and *effect* which never had a beginning and will never have an end. This is inconceivable, and therefore forms no premise, as we can not reason from a premise we can not understand. The other is that this concatenation of cause and effect runs back either near or remotely to an *uncaused cause,* or to the cause of all things which is not itself caused by an antecedent cause. This latter, while it may have its difficulties, is the only one that reason approves. This *uncaused cause* must be either *matter* or *mind;* it can not be matter, for the stream can not rise above the fountain, inasmuch as *mind* is confessedly superior to *matter,* or higher than matter. Therefore, matter can not originate mind. Mind must therefore be superior, and this mind the Bible calls God. Adam and all his posterity might have read in the Book of Nature until this day, without finding God. But when God takes Adam out and shows him his work, and reveals himself, then Adam can read God in all things by which he is

surrounded. Nature can not reveal God, because we have no standard of what God is, unless he reveals himself as the author of nature. So the morality of Christ would not alone prove his divinity, because we have no standard of what divine morality should be. But with its associates, *Son of God,* and *"able to save,"* it complements the others, and proves its possessor divine. The character of the Redeemer is reproduced in the redeemed, and by the law of *"grow into Christ in all things,"* the Christian is ultimately to be like Christ in his higher moral perfections. This is because the divine must always include *moral perfection.* But moral perfection does not necessarily include the divine; moral perfection is only the complement of man's duty to his fellow-man; or the duty of man to man teaches moral perfection.

Christ's Resurrection. What may we regard as the strongest proof of the resurrection of Christ? 1.

He showed himself alive after his death by many infallible proofs, being seen by the witnesses after his resurrection for forty days. That he did arise from the dead, admits of but one conclusion, without overthrowing the whole gospel. If he did not arise, then the apostles are false witnesses. There is no middle ground. If there is no reliability in their testimony, there is an end of all confidence in testimony. Nothing can be proved.

The case stands thus: Christ was put to death by—and in the power of—his bitterest enemies. That their work and purpose was accomplished, there is no doubt, unless we suppose a greater miracle than any needed in the affirmative. The only fear they could have was that his disciples would steal him away, and say he was risen from the dead. They had it in their power to use all necessary precaution. Their implacable enmity warrants

the conclusion that they would leave nothing undone in this regard. He was buried by those who were indifferent, but who did not expect he would arise from the dead. He was guarded by those who were entirely indifferent as to everything connected with his death or resurrection, except to *obey orders*. With all the fidelity, therefore, of a *Roman guard*, they executed their orders The apostles did not expect him to rise from the dead. They were intimidated and scattered, each to his original calling. Their hopes were disappointed. It is altogether improbable that in this state of mind they would venture upon so perilous an expedient, in the face of such danger and of such a guard. That he was not in the grave after the third day, is admitted by all parties. That within fifty days of his crucifixion the apostles affirmed that he was alive, and gave such overwhelming proof of his resurrection that upon the first day of its presentation three thousand persons on the spot accepted it as an established fact. That no persons could give higher evidence of *sincerity* and *honesty* than the apostles. If he did not arise from the dead, they must have known it. And on such an hypothesis, the apostles were second only as impostors to Christ himself, who must have been the prince of impostors. But this is harder to believe than all the statements of the apostles. That men so corrupt as they must have been, on this hypothesis, could originate such a system of beneficence and self-denial as the gospel, is indeed harder to believe than the gospel itself.

"If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

Christian Church. Is it right for the church which we belong to, to be called the *Christian* Church? Is that the right and proper name for it?

The primitive churches were called "Churches of

Christ," "the Church of God." We nowhere read of the Christian Church, or Disciples' Church. While the members individually are called disciples, and Christians, the church is always spoken of with reference to its divine Founder, or else the simple phrase, "the church," is used, with the name of Christ or God implied. See 1 Cor. 1:2; Gal. 1:2, 22; Rom. 16:16; Rev. 1:4. It is proper to speak of the Christian Church when it is placed in opposition to the Jewish or any other church; but when we look for a name by which to be known, it is best to adhere strictly to Scriptural names, especially as we profess to stand on ground on which all Christians can unite without having anything of human authority forced on them.

Christian Connection, Doctrine and Practice. What are the doctrinal and practical differences between the Christians (New Lights) and the Disciples? Or what are the doctrinal and practical objections to the Christian (New Light) church?

Doctrinally, the people referred to are Arians, or semi-Arians, with whom it is a special point that the Lord Jesus Christ is a created and dependent being. So, at least, we understand them. But we do not suppose this is true of them all.

They are Methodistic in their notions and methods of conversion—using the anxious-seat, and teaching that the Holy Spirit operates directly on the heart of the sinner, and gives him a direct witness of the pardon of his sins.

They deny baptism for remission of sins, and receive persons into the church without baptism.

They are not all alike, however; some of them are very nearly in harmony with us—others are far removed from us in all of the particulars above mentioned. The "Christians" of Virginia, represented by the *Christian*

Sun, are Trinitarian in faith, but practice sprinkling or pouring as well as immersion, while the western Christians are anti-Trinitarian, and, we believe, practice only immersion.

Christians and Beer. Is it compatible with the Christian profession for a church-member to be a regular beer drinker, frequenting for that purpose a common saloon, though not drinking to drunkenness? Please cite any Scriptures on the subject. DISCIPLE.

It seems like an insult to the common sense of our readers to attempt a serious answer to such a question. The Bible says nothing about beer, or about saloons; and according to the style of reasoning adopted by some who are slaves not only to a false literalism, but to vicious interpretation, the man has a perfect right to drink beer in a saloon, until you can produce a *thus saith the Lord,* "Thou shalt not drink beer in a saloon." But there is a passage which says, "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give no offense, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved" (1 Cor. 10:31-33). If, then, beer-drinking in a saloon is (1) to the glory of God; (2) pleasing to the church of God; (3) profitable to others in leading to their salvation, it is all right. But if it is (1) to the dishonor of God; (2) an offense to the church of God; (3) to the injury rather than to the profit of others, encouraging them to go into evil company and to indulge in practices which are almost sure to lead to excess and to guide them to destruction rather than to salvation, then it is all wrong. No man has a right to dictate to him that he shall not drink beer. That is a matter in which others may give advice, but in which

they have no right to dictate. But when he comes out before the public to drink his beer, and enters into low associations, and his example involves the honor of the Christian name, and is likely to mislead others, then the church has a right to insist that he shall abandon what is clearly an improper class of associations and an injurious line of conduct. "No man liveth to himself."

Christians, and Siege of Jerusalem. Our preachers say that during the siege of Jerusalem, by Titus, not a Christian perished, but all made their escape. Where will I find a record of this? A BROTHER.

BELOIT, Kan., Dec. 11.

It is stated on the authority of the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius, who wrote early in the fourth century. He says that the Christians fled to Pella, being prophetically directed. (Ec. Hist. book iii. chap. v.) This is confirmed by the statement of Josephus, that "many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship when it was going to sink" (Book ii. chap. xx. sec. 1). This took place at a peculiar crisis—after Cestius Gallius, having laid siege to Jerusalem with every prospect of taking it, suddenly withdrew his forces; Josephus says he "retired from the city without any reason in the world" (Book ii. chap. xix. secs. 6, 7). This gave an opportunity for escape.

Christians, Individual Responsibility. When there is a number of disciples, living in a country where there is no Christian Church near, and no evangelist in the country, and one of the members having been an elder, and a good, earnest, devoted Christian, but not accustomed to speaking in public, two others that have been deacons, all having a good report, and all are anxious to be organized, or placed in working order, as they have almost got a home ready to go into, how shall we proceed? We are anxious to work for the cause, and do not wish to remain scattered as sheep without a shepherd. We have a Sun-

day-school and are striving to keep up life. Can we organize and select our officers and do it in a right manner? if so, how? and what in regard to the laying on of hands?

JOHN W. GARNER.

No difference whether any of their number have ever before been elders or deacons; if several disciples live contiguously, so that they can meet regularly, they ought to do so, and by *virtue of their discipleship* engage in prayer, praise, Scripture reading, exhortation, the Lord's Supper, and the contribution, according to their ability. The original right to do these things belongs not to elders, deacons or evangelists, but to Christians, as such. They are all kings and priests of God, and have a right to minister at the altar. The appointment of officers is not because none others can administer the ordinances, but because *order* and *efficiency* require that, as a church grows in numbers, there should be some whose special business it shall be to watch over her spiritual and temporal interests. When *order* requires this, then it becomes *disorderly* to ignore such arrangements; but where necessity overrides the demands of order, as in the case referred to above, it is altogether proper to conduct the worship without the presence of either deacons or elders. It is wise under such circumstances for the brethren who agree to meet, to select those best fitted to take the lead, and request them to act for the time being, or until some more permanent arrangement can be made. Probably in this case the elder and deacons referred to are the best men. But it should be understood definitely that the arrangement is *provisional,* and only to continue until a more satisfactory arrangement can be made—that is, until gifts are found in the church such as may lead to a permanent ministry.

Of course there is no need of laying on of hands in

such a temporary arrangement. All it needs is the approval of those who are to be associated as the church in that place.

As soon as it is ascertained that there are persons Scriptually qualified to act as elders and deacons, they should be permanently appointed. If the brethren are at a loss how to proceed, they had better send for some competent man to instruct them in the matter.

Christians, Their Relation to Sects. Is there any propriety in Christians assisting to build sectarian church houses?

A.

Is there any propriety in our *receiving* assistance from them in building *our* houses? If so, one good turn deserves another.

Suppose no houses of worship were built but those built by us; does our querist think it would be for the advantage, morally and religiously, of the world at large? Suppose nothing were done for promoting the moral and religious welfare of the people but what we are doing; does he think it would be well? When we are prepared to take the work off the hands of the various religious bodies, who now share in it, and can pledge ourselves that it shall not suffer loss, then, and not until then, may we be indifferent to the influence they exert in behalf of morals and piety. In aiding to build houses of worship, men are governed by various moitives—among others, by the influence of churches in conserving the moral and religious interests of the community. Without approving all that is taught by those whom we aid, we may be satisfied that the tendency of their preaching and teaching is to promote virtue, faith and piety—a work everywhere needed and in the accomplishment of which all good men feel interested. On this ground many help us to build houses who do not approve all our teachings,

and on the same ground we may, with propriety, help others.

R. **Christmas, History of.** Is the 25th day of December the birthday of Christ?

When is old Christmas?

Who changed the date from old Christmas to the 25th of December, and what year was the change made?

What day is supposed to be the birthday of Christ?

According to the spurious Decretals, the institution of the Christmas festival is attributed to Telesphorus, who flourished in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-61 A. D.), but the first certain traces of it are found about the time of the Emperor Commodus (180-92 A. D.). In the reign of Diocletian (284-305 A. D.), while the ruler was keeping court at Nicomedia, he learned that a multitude of Christians were assembled in the city to celebrate the birthday of Jesus, and having ordered the church doors to be closed, he set fire to the building, and all the worshipers perished in the flames. We know of no evidence, however, that there was any uniform observance of a particular day at that time. It appears to have been celebrated by the earlier churches in April or May, and by some churches in January. In the fourth century, through the urgency of Cyril of Jerusalem, Julius I. issued an order for an investigation to be made concerning the day of Christ's nativity, which resulted in an agreement by the theologians of the East and West upon the 25th of December as the day. "The chief grounds for the decision were the tables of the censors in the archives of Rome; and although, in the opinion of some of the Fathers, there was not authentic proof of the identification of the day, yet the decision was uniformly accepted, and from that time the nativity has been celebrated throughout the church on the same day."

It may be well to remark here, that among the northern nations the heathen festival of the birth of Sol was on the 25th of December, and that Christmas, and the custom of making presents on Christmas eve, succeeded to this heathen festival, retaining the name of *Yule* or *Inul; i. e.,* the "Wheel," or revolution of the sun. The Roman Saturnalia, or festival of Saturn, was also in December, and many of its features passed over finally into Christmas festivals.

Chambers' Cyclopædia comments upon this matter as follows:

> Among the causes that co-operated in fixing this period as the proper one, perhaps the most powerful was, that almost all the heathen nations regarded the winter solstice as a most important point of the year, as the beginning of the renewed life and activity of the powers of nature, and of the gods, who were originally merely the symbolical personifications of these. In more northerly countries, this fact must have made itself peculiarly palpable—hence the Celts and Germans, from the oldest times, celebrated the season with the greatest festivities. At the winter solstice, the Germans held their great yule-feast in commemoration of the return of the fiery sun-wheel; and believed that, during the twelve nights reaching from the 25th of December to the 6th of January, they could trace the personal movements and interferences on earth of their great deities, Odin, Berchta, etc. Many of the beliefs and usages of the old Germans, and also of the Romans, passed over from heathenism to Christianity, and have partly survived to the present day.

We do not understand what our querist refers to, when he speaks of change of date. If he refers to the change from old style to new, January 5, new style, would be Christmas day, old style.

There is no divine authority for the observance of December 25, or any other day, in commemoration of the birth of Jesus. But since the day is generally observed as a festival, there is no impropriety in utilizing it as a

day of religious observance, social cheer and benevolent deeds.

Church Comity. Is there any Scripture or apostolic precedent to justify one or more contiguous congregations in receiving an excluded member of a sister church without a letter, reconciliation or consultation with said sister church?

Congregations sustain a certain relation to each other. If not, there is no sense in giving letters of dismissal from one church to another. But if the practice of giving such letters, and of receiving persons as members on the basis of such testimonials, is founded in propriety and justice, then it is manifestly improper and unjust to ignore this practice and act in defiance of it. It is a violation of sisterly obligations—and therefore disorderly and immoral—when one church receives to membership the excluded members of another church, or disaffected members of a neighboring church without letters of honorable dismissal. When such persons apply for membership, the church to which they belong should be at once notified of the fact. If there are good reasons to suppose that they have been unfairly dealt with in their own churches, it is right for the church to which they apply, to send messengers to the other church to inquire into the matter, and to proffer their kind offices to bring about a better understanding; but to receive her members into fellowship without her knowledge and consent is manifestly improper and unjust—unless she has become so recreant to the common faith as no longer to be recognized as a sister church.

Church Debts. 1. What should be done with a church that does not pay its debts?

2. What should a preacher do who preaches for a small salary, and even then can not get his pay, and, on account of it, can not pay his own debts, or suitably provide for his family?

And all this, too, when the preacher is called by the unanimous vote, and almost the unanimous desire, of the church for which he labors. A SUFFERER.

1. Preach to them frequently from the text, "Owe no man anything," until they repent. But do not bring in your own grievances. There is need for much instruction on *honesty*, and for chasing up the current dishonesties through all the crooked dealings of every-day life. But while it should be done manfully, it should not be done morosely. There is a style of discourse at once pungent, searching, earnest and tender, yet free from extravagance or recklessness of statement, which commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. While we have little confidence in propounding mere ethics in the pulpit, we are satisfied that there is great need of a faithful application of Christian principles to the affairs of daily life; but it must not be mere scolding or denunciation. A series of sermons on truth-telling, covenant-keeping, family training, business morality, and on the application of Christian principles to money-making, dress and equipage, labor, recreation, social life, etc., would be of service in every church. But it is difficult to deal with church debts, for the reason that the responsibility is divided among so many. It can only be remedied as you can elevate the standard of church life, and this can be reached only by patient labor in the right direction.

2. If he is satisfied that he is in the right place for usefulness, he can do one of two things. (1) Give them such an amount of labor as he can afford for what they actually pay him, and bestow the rest of his time on other fields. (2) Buy or rent a house and a few acres of land, and spend part of his time in laboring with his hands. He can raise his own garden vegetables, corn,

potatoes and hay, chickens, ducks and geese, the small fruits, etc., and make half his living in this way. Perhaps this may prove better for his own health, and he may have greater intellectual and moral vigor if he spends part of his time hoeing corn and potatoes, than if he gave all his time to digging about Greek roots. We never saw the time when, if a church failed to keep its promises, we could not turn our hands to something that would make up their deficiencies.

But if the failure to pay grows out of a want of appreciation of the preacher's services, or out of a low moral principle, after it is settled that he can not reform them, he had better leave before he becomes hopelessly entangled in debt. There is, in many cases, a sad lack of integrity on the part of churches in dealing with their preachers. Sometimes, in their eagerness to secure a preacher's services, they promise more than they can pay. But in most cases the failure is owing to the lack of system and the lack of efficient managers. If the preacher is wise and can quietly remedy these defects, and bring the church into good working order, he will overcome the difficulty without seeming to know anything about it. What we call *deacons* are a much more important class of church ministers than they are generally allowed to be. Few things are so essential to the prosperity of a church as two or three good financiers, who have the skill and the patience and the ambition to bring the members generally into regular contributing. Convert your deacons, and stand by them and strengthen them, and you will not have much cause to complain.

A church, like an individual, will find that in the long run dishonesty don't pay. Rich spiritual blessings are not linked with dishonesty, nor with indifference to obligations.

Church, Greek Catholic vs. Roman Catholic. State what were the chief causes which led to the separation of the Greek and Latin churches and the period when it took place.

No doubt the causes were in part political, and operated early—such as the division of the empire under Arcadius and Honorius; the alienation occasioned by the barbarian conquest of the West, which not only annihilated the former relations and reciprocal dependence of the two empires, but produced a rapid and great change in the character of the Western clergy, and even in the principles of the church; and the mutual insults and violence of Leo the Isaurian and Pope Gregory II., and the civil war which broke out between them, which resulted in the transfer of certain jurisdiction in Sicily and the south of Italy from the Roman to the Constantinopolitan See—all of which tended to a continual weakening of the bonds that held the East and West together.

But the immediate causes were more purely ecclesiastical and doctrinal—such as the controversy respecting the celebration of Easter, and the strife for supremacy between the sees of Constantinople and Rome. This strife was bitter and long continued. The assumption of the title of Universal Bishop by John the Faster, then Primate of the East, intensified this dispute and kept up the quarrel. The transfer of this title by the Emperor Phocas to Pope Boniface III., of Rome, added fuel to the flame; and although this was but an ecclesiastical strife, it tended continually to weaken the bonds of sympathy between the East and the West. During the eighth century the Latin or Western church adopted the doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father *and the Son,* whereas the original creed of the Latin as well as of the Greek church taught that the Spirit proceeded from the Father only.

In 853 Photius was raised to the patriarchal throne by Emperor Michael, who removed and banished Ignatius. The latter appealed to Rome. Pope Nicholas I. summoned a council and excommunicated Photius and his abettors. Photius in turn excommunicated Nicholas, and in doing so brought out the differences between the eastern and western churches. 1. The Romans fasted on the seventh day of the week. 2. In the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese. 3. They prohibited their priests to marry, and separated from their wives such as were married when they went into orders. 4. They authorized bishops alone to anoint baptized persons with the holy chrism, withholding that power from presbyters. 5. That they had interpolated the creed of Constantinople by the insertion of *Filioque,* and held the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as the Father.

Then the emperor withdrew from the Papal jurisdiction various provinces, and gave them to the Patriarch of Constantinople; and Photius also took Bulgaria under his own jurisdiction. After this Photius was deposed and Ignatius restored. Then Photius was again recalled and again deposed. This perpetual interference of Rome in the affairs of the East led to further alienation. About the middle of the eleventh century a violent rupture occurred between the patriarch Michael Gerularius and Pope Leo IX. Legates were invited from Rome to Constantinople with a view to heal the schism; but, failing in this, they publicly excommunicated the patriarch and all his adherents in the church of St. Sophia, deposited the written act of their anathema on the grand altar of the temple, and, shaking the dust from their feet, departed. This may be regarded as consummating the separation. This occurred in 1054.

The Church vs. the Kingdom. The statement was made in the pulpit of the church of Christ at this place, that the Baptists make more of baptism than we do, because they say it is the door into the church; thus putting baptism in the place of Jesus, who says, "I am the door; if any man enter by me," etc. (John 10). To this the Baptist minister objected, saying by it the Baptists were misrepresented.

In a private conversation with said Baptist minister, I drew from him this statement: "While they do not now teach, nor ever have taught, that baptism is the door into the church, it is the door into the kingdom of Christ, but not into the church of Christ."

He would not accept that the church of Christ and the kingdom of Christ were one and the same—applying the word "church" always to the local congregation, which was something in the kingdom of Christ. To my mind, he makes a distinction between the church and kingdom without a difference.

You will find the Baptist view quite fully set forth as to the difference between the church of Christ and kingdom of Christ in "Theodosia; or, The Heroine of Faith," vol. 2, p. 68, "Third day's travel." What says the editor of the STANDARD on this point? E. B. C.

MEXICO, Mo., Aug. 27.

There is abundant room for dodging here, and an endless and profitless war of words might be carried on through attaching different meanings to the same word. Church, kingdom, door, are all terms which may be so differently used by disputants, as always to leave room for a charge of misrepresentation, when no actual misrepresentation is made or intended. On the whole matter, we observe:

1. Baptism is never in the Scriptures called a door into the church, or a door into anything else. Faith is thought by some to be called a door in Acts 14:27: "And how he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles." This, however, does not, to our mind, say that faith is the door into the church, but simply that God

had offered to the Gentiles an opportunity to believe, just as a door of utterance (Col. 4:3) is not that utterance is the door, but an opportunity to utter. See, also, 1 Cor. 16:9; 2 Cor. 2:12. Yet if baptism is the ordained means of entrance into the church, there is no impropriety in calling it a door in that sense

2. Although Christ is the door, he admits us by means of his truth and his ordinances. Without contradicting this, therefore, it may be said that baptism is the door, if it is by baptism that Christ admits us. Christ says, "I am the truth." It does not contradict this when he says, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." The chief objection, in our mind, to speaking of baptism as a door, is that it is a narrow and partial view of the subject. Faith, repentance and baptism combined are the door, or means of entrance. It is by a birth of water and of the Spirit that we enter into the kingdom.

3. It strikes us that the Baptist minister above spoken of is mistaken as to the general view of Baptists. They regard baptism as the door into the local church, but they come into the kingdom before baptism, by spiritual regeneration. Hence they may be legitimately and constitutionally citizens of the kingdom and Christians in the full sense without baptism; but they can not be members of a Scriptural local church without baptism. We think we are not mistaken in this. Hence results what is called "close communion." The Lord's Supper is an ordinance in the local church. Baptism is the door into that church. None, therefore, but the baptized can be admitted to it. Hence, too, the common style among Baptist preachers: "I baptize ——— into the fellowship of the Baptist Church."

4. Whether church and kingdom are equivalents or

not, does not affect this controversy. In our judgment, while they frequently refer to the same thing and may be taken as equivalents, yet not always. The word "kingdom" has a range of application that is not given to the word "church." See Matt. 8: 11, 12. The word "church" has a complete sense in its application to a local community of believers, that is not characteristic of the word "kingdom." But where church is used in its enlarged sense, and kingdom in its application to the reign of Christ, they are more nearly equivalents.

Church Letters. Is it the duty of the church to notice objections (of one who is not a member) against the church giving a letter of commendation? R. C. ALLEN.
GREENSBURG, Ind.

It may be. If, on application being made for a letter, any *reputable* person, not a member of the church, were to charge that said member is unworthy of such letter, it would be the duty of the church to pause and ascertain whether there was sufficient ground for such objection. Indeed, if such charge were made, any worthy member against whom it was uttered would, it seems to us, at once insist that the charge should be investigated. There is no good reason why we should disregard the testimony of men of good repute because they do not belong to the church. It calls for caution, lest the charge be inspired by unworthy motives. It is due to the person charged to protect him from such complaint, if it be ill-founded, and due to the church that she may, on one hand, protect her members, and, on the other, protect herself from complicity with wrong.

Church-member, Charges Against. Should the church of the Lord Jesus Christ receive evidence against a member of the church from persons not belonging to the church? Should

the church receive such testimony under any circumstances? If so, what are some of the circumstances? W. O. KING.

BELLPLAIN, Minn.

If charges are preferred against a member of the Christian Church, and no member of that organization knows anything that could be received as facts against his or her character, is the church under any obligations to take any notice of outside reports, or admit of such as evidence in the church?

PETER CHADDERDON.

There is nothing in the New Testament, known to us, which limits the witnesses to members of the church. There is, on the contrary, a recognition of a certain value as belonging to the current testimony of outsiders, in the fact that no man is to be appointed to the office of bishop unless he have "a good report of them that are without." This places a value on outside testimony, and assumes that, under ordinary circumstances, the judgment of the outside world on a man's character is likely to be correct.

Since the New Testament requires that charges shall be established by a certain number of witnesses, and does not make membership in the church a necessary qualification of a witness, why should we attempt to establish such a limitation? It is true that, in receiving testimony from outsiders, there is need to inquire into the character of the witnesses, and learn if there is any bias or dislike of the church, or dislike of the person witnessed against, that may corrupt their testimony; but this is necessary also if the witnesses are church-members. Public rumor is a sufficient reason to justify the brethren in looking after the matter; and if they find sufficient reason to believe that the evidence offered is sincere, unprejudiced and convincing, they should prefer a charge on the basis of public rumor, as well for the sake of the person charged as for the sake of the church. Indeed, the person charged should himself ask for an investigation. If

the evidence is unmistakable, he should be condemned; if it is found to be indefinite or untrustworthy, he should be vindicated, and the church should stand by him.

Church, Minority vs. Majority in. Suppose the church should have a regular meeting to decide who should preach for them, and a majority by a ballot vote should decide in favor of a certain brother, and the minority should refuse to submit, and absent themselves from the meetings of the brethren, and this same minority say they have nothing against the brother *elect,* but they want a change. What is the duty of the majority in such a case? A. C.

The duty of the *minority* is to submit to the voice of the *majority*. It is not a case in which there are any conscientious scruples, but simply personal preferences. The instruction of Peter, "Let the younger be in subjection to the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another," should teach these brethren to surrender their preferences and be in subjection to the decision of the majority. "Study the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another," is another piece of inspired counsel, which should have weight in such cases. The peace of the church and its edification should never be disturbed by mere personal preferences. Nor is it, as a rule, advisable for a church, when there is a clear, unbiased decision of a majority on such a point, to yield to the discontent of a minority—especially when such discontent is expressed in such an unlawful and disorderly way; for if such were the rule, a handful of malcontents could tyrannize over the church at will.

At the same time, there may be circumstances that would greatly modify this judgment. The minority may embrace in it much of the spiritual worth of the church —those whose judgment is worth a great deal more than can be expressed by mere numbers. It may be made up

of the earnest workers of the church, who have a right to an influential voice in such matters. In such cases the mere fact of a majority of votes ought not to be pressed in defiance of the respect due to such brethren, nor would it be wise in any preacher to insist on serving a church against a strong and decided opposition from such a source. We do not, however, think that that class would exhibit their dissatisfaction in this disorderly way.

Difference of *opinion*—and that is what this is—should never be allowed to interfere with Christian fellowship. Such differences will necessarily arise; and when they do arise, the law of Christian love would teach a sacrifice of opinion and preference for the sake of the church. He who disturbs the peace of a church for such a reason, becomes a factionist. No compromise should be made with such while they pursue a factious course. If they return to their duty, and demean themselves peaceably, but still insist on a reconsideration of the action of the church, it may then become a question whether the preacher and the majority shall, for the sake of the peace and prosperity of the church, respect the wishes of the minority, and magnanimously yield. But love itself demands no such yielding to the rebellious.

It is best to labor with these brethren to convince them of the unreasonableness and unlawfulness of their course in forsaking the church on account of a mere difference of opinion. If they are Christians, and are properly approached, they will yield this point and retire to their places. If they return, it will then be in order to confer on the difference of opinion, and reach a conclusion, in a spirit of love, that will be generally satisfactory. If they will not return, they are liable to be dealt with as factionists. It is a case in which much love and forbearance should be exercised to overcome the diffi-

culty. Good people, for want of proper instruction in such matters, are often betrayed by their feelings into unlawful ways.

Church on Earth. There is a controversy here between a Disciple and a Baptist and they have agreed to have you decide it. It is this: Does the language used by the apostle in 1 Cor. 13:9-12, and also Eph. 4:12, 13, all refer to this life, or the future life, or both? Please answer at length.

BURLINGTON, Mich. M. HADSELL.

In our judgment, the reference, in both cases, is to the church on earth—the church in its infancy, when it was supplied with miraculous gifts, and the church fully developed for its work on earth. The apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, were all divinely given and miraculously endowed; but this was only to continue until the divinely appointed means for developing the *natural* gifts of the members of the body were completed; and then the body, by the culture and development of the various gifts of its various members, would edify itself in love. The undisputed fact is that these divinely endowed apostles, prophets, etc., etc., ceased with the first age, and the means of church edification have ever since been found in the cultivation of the natural gifts of the members of the body. There is no getting away from the facts; and these facts compel us to an interpretation consistent with them. But there is really no compulsion in this case—it is the legitimate interpretation of the passage in Ephesians.

In 1 Corinthians 13 it must not be forgotten that Paul had been discussing this very question of spiritual gifts, and proceeds to show "a more excellent way" than trust in such gifts. He assures them that whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; or tongues—that is, languages which they were miraculously empowered to speak—they

shall cease; or knowledge—that is, knowledge supernaturally communicated, as spoken of in verse 2—it shall vanish away. These gifts, he teaches them, are the property of infancy, and are "childish things" which will not be needed in the full manhood of the church. They will therefore pass away with the infancy of the church; but faith, hope and love will abide.

Here, again, we remark that the facts shut us up to this interpretation. The prophecies, the tongues, knowledge supernaturally communicated, *did cease* with the first age. Faith, hope and love abide. We see not how to avoid the conclusion that the infancy of the church was in the age of miracles, and that when the church was sufficiently endowed with the means of self-development, that infancy, with the miracles necessary to support it, passed away.

Circumcision Not with Hands. Will you please explain Col. 2:11, 12? What I desire to get at is, what is it to be circumcised with the circumcision made without hands?

WM. MILLER.

The true reading of the text is: "In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not wrought with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh ["of the sins of" is omitted by all the oldest MSS.] by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in your baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through the faith in the operation of God, who raised him from the dead."

The circumcision not wrought with hands—a circumcision in the spirit, and not in the letter (see Rom. 2:29)—is declared to be "the putting off of the body of the flesh"—the same as is expressed under another figure (Gal. 5:24): "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." It is the cutting off

of sinful desires and habits and purposes—destroying the old sinful dominion in our hearts and lives. This is accomplished by Christ or in Christ by the circumcision that Christ performs, and it is accomplished for us, not by baptism alone, but by that death to sin and burial and resurrection with him which come through faith and baptism. By the whole process of conversion, as expressed in faith, repentance and baptism, Christ puts away from us the old dominion of the flesh, and we enter on a new life. This separation from the dominion of sin and consecration to a life of righteousness, is the spiritual circumcision, in opposition to the fleshly.

Circumcision of Timothy. A difference arose in our Sunday-school, in reference to what Paul had Timothy circumcised for. I wish you to give your view of Acts 16:3, and thereby instruct a Bible student, and, perhaps, many others.

WINAMAC, Ind. DAVID PATTISON.

Luke states expressly that it was *because of the Jews,* who knew that his father was a Greek. The offspring of such mixed marriages were not held in esteem by the Jews, and if, in addition to the fact that he was half Gentile, it was found that he was uncircumcised, it would effectually close the ears of the Jews against Paul's preaching. Paul therefore circumcised him to prevent any needless cause of offense on the part of unconverted Jews, to prevent them from hearing the gospel. It was not because of the *Christians,* nor because of the *value of circumcision,* but because of the Jews. See 1 Cor. 9:20; 10:32, 33.

It may be asked, Why, then, did he refuse to circumcise Titus? We answer: (1) Because Titus was a Gentile (Gal. 2:3), whereas Timothy, through his mother, was a Jew; (2) because Timothy was circumcised to remove a stumbling-block out of the way of unconverted

Jews; while the circumcision of Titus was demanded by professed Christian teachers, who wished to enslave all Christians to the law of Moses—and therefore Paul would not yield to them. Timothy's circumcision violated no Christian principle; Titus' circumcision would have been a surrender of Christian principle.

Circuses, Christians Attending. 1. Is it right for Christians to attend circus shows?

2. Is it right to go to a circus show where there is an animal show combined?

3. Is it right for Christians to take stock in, and to attend, agricultural fairs where horse-racing is a part of the published program?

4. Is it right to attend Fourth of July celebrations where dancing is patronized by at least one-half the crowd from morning until late at night?

These queries come from a new country. We understand their bearing perhaps better than many of our readers will, unless we explain. In the newer States and Territories, Christian families often move in and settle where for years they are destitute of religious society, and their fervency of spirit necessarily decreases, while their diligence in business increases until they are completely absorbed, or nearly so, in the struggle for worldly gain. Meanwhile, their families grow up with but little opportunity of good associations, and in a monotonous round of toil which leads them to welcome anything that will give a little variety to their tame lives. Hence, circus day, or fair day, or a Fourth of July celebration, is to them a day of rare attraction. In their eagerness for relief from the everlasting round of toil, they are not very particular about the *morality* of the change, so as it brings enough variety and enough excitement to lead them to forget the monotony of every-day life. After awhile, religious meetings are held.

These, too, are a pleasant change, and are largely attended on this account, and when half-apostate Christians are gathered up, and new converts are made among those to whom circuses and dances and fairs have been the sweetest relief of their lives, it is difficult to make them believe or feel that there is anything wrong in attendance at such places. It does not do, therefore, to be too impatient or too exacting. Patiently educate them into better ideas and tastes. Quietly arrange a better class of associations and entertainments for them. In due time they will outgrow these coarser tastes and find enjoyment in something worthier. With these preliminary remarks, we answer:

1. The mere witnessing of feats of horsemanship would not be improper. But taking circuses as they generally are found to be, with a low order of clownish jokes and performances bordering on vulgarity, and a studied effort to minister to a very gross sort of sensationalism, they are not fit places of resort for Christians or their families.

2. A menagerie is a place of healthful interest and valuable instruction. It can generally be visited without going to the circus. To behold the works of God, and learn of the wisdom and power of the Creator through his works, is laudable. All children should be interested, if possible, in the study of natural history, and especially of that branch of it known as zoology.

3. No. Horse-racing is clearly and inevitably demoralizing, and to be condemned under all circumstances. Along with it go betting, drinking, swearing and unhallowed excitement bordering on the brutal. Christians should demand that agricultural fairs be separated entirely from such performances, and if this can not be effected, should *unanimously* condemn them by staying

away and withholding all patronage. If they would thus make their voice heard, their demands would soon be respected.

4. No. All such extravagances are an insult to the Christian sentiment of any community, and should be reprobated. Whatever differences of opinion may be found on some phases of the dancing question, there is no doubt that the promiscuous dancing on such occasions leads to bad associations, unhealthy excitement, undue intimacy of the sexes and wicked carousals. It is impossible to justify Christians in any participation in these follies and madness.

Citizenship, Roman. 1. In how many ways could a man become a Roman citizen?

2. In which of these ways did Paul become a Roman citizen?

CHAPLIN, Ky. W. I. FOWLE.

Roman citizenship was obtained principally by parentage or by purchase, though it might be acquired in other ways. Captives were taken in war and reduced to slavery. These slaves, when properly manumitted, as they sometimes were, generally on account of some particular service rendered, became citizens, and their children inherited citizenship from them. It is thought by many that Saul's father had obtained citizenship in that way, but this is only a conjecture. But Paul *inherited* his citizenship, as is evident from Acts 22:28. In some way his father, though a Hebrew, had obtained Roman citizenship—probably by service rendered to the state or by purchase. Some have even supposed that, Tarsus being a free city—an *urbs libera*—Saul, as a native of Tarsus, was born free. But this is a mistake; for, as Meyer says, it was not a *colonia* or *municipium*, but merely enjoyed the right of being governed by its own magistrates, the Roman sovereignty.

Civil Government and Christians. 1. May a Christian vote or hold office under any political government? 2. May a Christian take a civil oath? Does not our Saviour forbid *all* oaths to his people? 3. Have we to rely only upon the histories of Roman Catholics for our knowledge of political and ecclesiastical matters from the close of the third century to the time of the Reformation? If there are any other authentic writers of those times, be pleased to give me a list of them.

1. As that is a matter of which the New Testament does not treat, we have only to say as Paul says of all such matters: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind," and "let no one judge his brother." Our opinion is that a Christian *may* vote and hold office under any government that leaves him free to perform his Christian duties. We reason this way: Paul pleaded the *rights* of a Roman citizen. No one can justly claim the *rights* of citizenship without at the same time recognizing its *obligations*. He who holds to its rights and obligations may fairly possess its privileges and perform its duties. Under a government like ours, therefore, where a Christian is entitled to vote and to hold office, we see nothing in the New Testament to hinder him from so doing. But while he *may* do so, whether he *ought* to do it is another question, the answer to which must depend on various conditions. It may take him from a more important calling; it may throw him into the way of temptations too strong for him; it may involve him in unhappy strifes; it may imperil his Christian standing. On the other hand, it may open a large field of usefulness; it may enable him to displace dishonest and corrupt men, and subserve the best interests of government; it may give him great power against wrong, and enable him to honor his Master in a responsible position. The answer must depend on such considerations as these.

2. We have no scruples about taking an oath such as is spoken of above, as we do not regard the divine prohibition to relate to such oaths at all. Nevertheless, if any have scruples, let them be content to make affirmation. Affirming, under the law, has all the force of swearing, and the pains and penalties of perjury go along with it, if false, as certainly as with swearing. It differs only in form, and to guard against the danger of error, it is best to adhere to this form.

3. Not *Roman* Catholics exactly. Before that period we have the work of Eusebius, with what he preserves of Hegesippus, and the writings of the Fathers. But from the time of the Nicene Council, we are dependent on Socrates, a jurist of Constantinople, whose history, in seven books, extends from 306 to 439; Sozomen, also a Constantinopolitan jurist, whose nine books cover nearly the same period; Theodoret, a Syrian bishop, whose five books cover nearly the same period; and Philostorgius, of whose twelve books relating to the same period only some extracts remain. Theodorus, of Constantinople, compiled, in the sixth century, a history from the authors we have named, and brought it down to 518, and Evagrius, a Syrian jurist, brought it down to 594. The Latin historians, Rufinus, Sulpicius Severus and Magnus Arelius Cassiodorus, drew their materials from the Greek sources we have mentioned. In the Middle Ages the Western church affords nothing worthy the name of church history, unless we allow the dignity to such works as those of Gregory of Tours, the English presbyter Bede, and Adam of Bremen—the history of the latter extending from Charlemagne to Henry IV. of France, and giving much valuable information relative to the Danish and Swedish churches. In the East, the *Scriptores Byzantini* were valuable sources of church his-

tory. Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria (940), composed in Arabic a chronicle of church history reaching down to 937, and Nicephorus Callisti wrote a work bringing church history down to 911, but part of it is lost.

The Lutheran Reformation awakened a new interest in this department of inquiry, and since that time both Protestants and Roman Catholics have been busy in it. They are not, however, dependent entirely on histories written aforetime. Monuments of art, inscriptions, original documents, civil statutes relating to ecclesiastical affairs, acts of councils, official writings of the popes, ruels of monastic orders, liturgies, apologies and theological writings, whether dogmatic or polemic, are all sources of information to the church historian.

It is true, however, that we are often mainly dependent on their enemies for the knowledge we have of the (so called) heretical sects—and this should never be forgotten in studying their history.

Colenso, Bishop. Will you please give in the STANDARD a brief history of Bishop Colenso? Is he an infidel, as some say? Dean Stanley has, it is rumored, invited him to preach in Westminster Abbey, and the faithful among the Episcopalians seem to be very much agitated over it. Why this opposition to him? Is it because of his being an infidel, as is reported?

A READER.

The term *infidel* is too indefinite. Colenso, bishop of Natal, is largely rationalistic. His work on the Pentateuch reveals an utter want of faith in its inspiration, and if the principles that governed his reasoning were carried out, we see not why it should not land him in infidelity. We do not understand, however, that he pushes his reasoning to any such extent. The Church of England retains in her fellowship many men—such as the author of "Essays and Reviews"—who are rational-

istic, but who still manage, either for the sake of place, or by virtue of very elastic consciences, to retain their places as ministers. Colenso, we suppose, is one of these. We believe there was an attempt to take away his ecclesiastical dignity, but the highest courts decided against it. The bishops of Oxford, Lincoln and London forbade him to preach in their dioceses, but Dean Stanley is free from Episcopal dictation, and acted on his own responsibility. Colenso did not accept his invitation.

Collection, Duty of. What shall be done in this case: If there is a member of the church who opposes the penny collection to be taken up on Lord's Day? Shall we neglect that which Paul required the Corinthian brethren to do, for the sake of one, or shall we continue? Please answer. M. C. F.

We are not aware that Paul required the Corinthians to take up a "penny collection." He taught them to lay by, on the first day of the week, for a special benevolent purpose, "as God had prospered them." If pennies are all that mark their prosperity, why, pennies it should be; if dollars, then dollars it should be; if hundreds of dollars, then hundreds of dollars should be given. If that is what you mean by penny collection, all right. It is questionable whether Paul's direction to the Corinthians was intended as a law to all churches. But, if the church has determined on this as the best method of raising money, the brother referred to should submit to their decision, in the absence of any divine law as to the method of raising money. In all such expedients the will of the church should rule, and any one who favors some other plan should submit to his brethren.

Communism, Christian. While reading the Book of Acts, a day or two ago, a question arose in my mind which I would like if you would assist me to answer: How shall we meet the force of the argument that may be brought against us in this wise? You people profess to have gone back, or desire

to go back, to the ancient order of things, and contend that whatever is of positive command, or apostolic precedent or example, or legitimate inference, only should be made a term of communion, or test of fellowship; now why do you fall short, and thus stultify your argument by not having all things common as they did? See Acts 2:44; 4:32, 34-37. E. L. ALLEN.

STOYESTOWN, Pa., Feb. 18.

1. Read Acts 5:4, from which it is evident that none was *required* to do this. It therefore had not the force of a divine command or ordinance.

2. The succeeding history of the churches mentioned in the New Testament clearly shows that no such community of goods anywhere else obtained. It can not, therefore, be regarded as any part of the apostles' teaching, but simply as a spontaneous outflow of Christian benevolence, which was permitted, but not ordained.

3. Because nothing is to be accepted as binding but that which is sustained by apostolic precept or precedent, it does not follow that everything is binding for which apostolic precedent can be pleaded. Else, as Paul and Barnabas had a quarrel, we would be bound to quarrel too; as Peter dissembled, we would be under obligation to dissemble; as Peter and James and Paul offered sarifices and kept the Jewish law, we would have to do so too.

Regard must be had to the question whether it is intended to form a part of their instruction to us, or whether it grew out of peculiar circumstances, and was only of personal, local or temporary importance. This can generally, in doubtful cases, be settled in the light of other Scriptures.

Commission, The, to Whom Given. Will you allow me to ask a few questions suggested by your reply to Peter Morey's query in the "Querists' Drawer" of the STANDARD of November 3?

1. Was the commission contained in Matt. 28:19, given to *all*

disciples, or only to the eleven to whom he was speaking in private, in a mountain in Galilee, where he had met them by appointment?

2. If that commission was intended for all disciples, why was it not given in a public manner, on a public occasion?

3. The word *sacrament,* according to Webster, signified:

(1) "Among ancient writers, mystery." Is there no "mystery" in the Lord's Supper? Is the simple eating of bread and drinking of wine *all* of it? Or are there not contained in it some of the hidden mysteries of God?

(2) "An oath; a ceremony producing an obligation." Does not the partaking of the Lord's Supper imply or produce any obligations?

(3) "In present usage, an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." Can any true Christian partake of the Lord's Supper, eat of the bread that represents his broken body, drink of the cup that represents his shed blood, and receive no "inward and spiritual grace"?

(4) Do the words of Peter (1 Pet. 2:5) refer to the Lord's Supper, or to a holy, spiritual life, as an offset to "laying aside all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies and evil speakings," to which he admonishes in the first verse of the same chapter?

There are other questions suggested by your reply; but I forbear, as their answers would involve more than could be crowded into the space allowed, or set apart for your excellent "Querists' Drawer." B.

1, 2. It was given to those to whom it was addressed. The fact that it was spoken to them *privately* does not warrant the idea that it was of no concern to any but themselves, any more than the fact of his showing himself alive, after his resurrection, only privately (Acts 10: 40, 41), would prove that his resurrection was of concern only to those to whom he appeared. All the "things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts 1:3) were spoken *privately,* but they were so spoken that the private hearers might make them public after the coming Spirit should "bring all things to their remembrance,"

whatsoever Jesus had spoken to them. Note carefully that these eleven apostles, to whom this commission was given, were to teach the *disciples* to observe all things whatsoever *they* (the apostles) had been commanded. Among the things they taught, they never taught anything about the Lord's Supper as a *sacrament,* nor about an order of clergy to administer it.

3. Two of your definitions, copied from Webster, are marked by him *obsolete*. We are not concerned now about the obsolete meanings of *sacrament*. But in reference to your questions—there is mystery in the Lord's Supper in the same sense in which there is mystery in everything. There is nothing in existence of which we can say that there is nothing more to be learned. But everything is not, on that account, a *sacrament*. God is a mystery, but he is not a sacrament. But that there is any *peculiar* mystery about the Lord's Supper, we do not believe, any more than about prayer, praise or almsgiving. The design of the ordinance and the manner of its observance are clearly set forth. It has been a favorite idea of the clergy to foster the idea of *mysteries* in religion, as a basis for their claim that the clergy alone were empowered to explain them.

Now as to the other meaning—an oath—what is there of this nature in the Lord's Supper? As applied to baptism, there may be found an analogy between it and the oath taken by soldiers to be true to their country and general; but in the Lord's Supper there is nothing of this. It is asked, "Does not the partaking of the Lord's Supper imply or produce any obligations?" We ask, in reply, Does not every religious act imply or produce obligations? Is every religious act therefore a sacrament? This hint will be sufficient for our clear-headed correspondent.

Let us now attend to Buck's definition of the word "sacrament," in its theological meaning:

"Sacrament is derived from the Latin word *sacramentum,* which signifies an oath, particularly the oath taken by soldiers to be true to their country and general. The word was adopted by the writers of the Latin church to denote those ordinances of religion by which Christians came under an obligation of obedience to God, which obligation, they supposed, was equally sacred with that of an oath."

He then quotes the definition of a sacrament given by the Church of England—"An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." Now, we object to any such application of the word to the Lord's Supper. It is not given to us as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, nor as "a pledge to assure us thereof." It has outward and visible signs of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus, and it is kept "in remembrance of him," and to "show forth his death till he come." Our querist asks, "Can any true Christian partake of it, and receive no inward and spiritual grace?" We ask in reply, Can a true Christian do *any* act of duty in the fear and love of God, and not receive an inward and spiritual grace? Is every act of duty a sacrament, therefore—an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace? If so, let us cease to speak of *the* sacrament, and let it be understood in what sense we use the word.

4. The words of Peter have no special reference to the Lord's Supper, but they have reference to *all* the "spiritual sacrifices" offered in the Lord's spiritual house; and for the offering of all or any of these spir-

itual sacrifices, *all* Christians are "a holy priesthood." There is no special class of priests or clergy in the h use of God. It is a question of *order,* not of *rank,* as to who shall offer prayer, or lead the praise, or give thanks for the bread and break it, or for the cup and pour out the wine. See, also, Rev. 1:6.

We are aware that these teachings made havoc with clerical pretensions and priestly claims and apostolical succession; but we can not help it, nor do we wish to help it. With the kindest feelings to all, we must insist upon the simplicity and spirituality of the New Testament church, and upon that equality of rank which our Lord announced when he said, "One is your Master, and all ye are brethren."

Common View of the Founder of Nineveh. 1. Will you please inform me who was the founder of Nineveh, and give your authority?

2. In Acts 21:18 we read, "Paul went with us unto James." In your notes on the lesson for October 14, you say that it was not the apostle James. Will you please give your authority for saying this? D. E. W.

MADISON, Lake Co., O.

1. According to the rendering in our common version (Gen. 10:11), it was Asshur. But the marginal rendering is, "Out of that land he went forth into Assyria, and founded Nineveh." This reading has the preference with modern scholars. If it is adopted, *he* refers to Nimrod. So Conant renders it; Murphy also. Canon Cook says, in his note on this verse:

"'From this land he went out into Assyria' is the rendering of all the Targums, of Nachmanides, and after them of Drusius, Bochart, Le Clerc, De Wette, Baumgarten, Tuch, Gesenius, Knobel, Delitzsch, Kalisch, and most modern interpreters. The syntax fully admits of

this interpretation; and the general sense of the passage requires it. Nimrod is the subject here treated of. Asshur, the son of Shem (verse 22), was at least a generation older than Nimrod, who may probably have first colonized the country called after him Asshur or Assyria; Nimrod, or one of his descendants, afterwards invading and governing that country."

Murphy, approving the translation given in the margin and approved by Cook, says in behalf of it:

"1. The discourse relates to Nimrod. 2. The words admit of it. 3. The word Asshur has occurred hitherto only as the name of a country. 4. Asshur, the person, was considerably older than Nimrod, and had probably given name to Asshur before Nimrod's projects began. 5. Asshur would have been as great a man as Nimrod if he had founded Nineveh and its contiguous towns; which does not appear from the text."

2. See *Teacher's Mentor* for December for an answer to this query.

It seems by chronology that Moses lived 1,575 years before Christ, and that a written language only dates at the beginning of the Medo-Persian Empire, about 536 years before Christ. How was the history of creation preserved, and how did Moses write, if there was no written language? MOSES ADAMSON.

ADAMSON, Kan.

It is a mistake that writing was unknown until the beginning of the Medo-Persian Empire. The study of Egyptian antiquities and the successful deciphering of their hieroglyphics has clearly shown that writing was known to that ancient people at an early date. Job 19: 23, 24; 31: 35, clearly show that writing was known in Job's time, which, whatever the differences may be as to his proper date, was clearly much more ancient than the date referred to by our querist. According to our Bible

chronology, Job is placed B. C. 1520, which leaves but twenty-nine years between his era and that of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. See, also, Ex. 17:14. Among the places mentioned in the land of Canaan, when conquered by the Israelites, we have Kirjath-sepher, the city of books; Kirjath-sannah, the city of letters (Josh. 15:49; Judg. 1:11). It is not unlikely that Canaan, a son of Ham, gave writing to the Canaanites, and that Misraim, another son of Ham, did the same for the Egyptians. For fuller information, see Smith's Bible Dictionary, Art. Writing.

In John 14 our Saviour appears to have addressed his apostles; but in the twelfth verse the grammatical relation is changed to the third person, "He that believeth." Is it to be understood in the change from the second to the third person singular as addressing them (apostles) individually, or to the disciples at large? v.

The verses immediately preceding indicate a spirit of doubt on the part of some of the apostles. The language of verse 12 seems to have been chosen with reference to this, to intimate to them that a spirit of doubt or unbelief on the part of any of them would prevent them from sharing in the great things promised. It was designed to discriminate among the apostles, and not to apply to disciples generally.

Communion for the Unimmersed Now. If an individual who was at the point of death, and who had been sprinkled, were to apply to you asking that a few of the brethren would meet with you and distribute to him the emblems representing the body of Christ, would you consider it sinful? If not antiscriptural or sinful, yould you think it expedient to do so?

SOUTHINGTON, Apr. 3, 1873. E. A. BOSWORTH.

There is a wide difference between such a person's coming to us where we are observing the Lord's Supper,

and on his own responsibility partaking with us, and our going to him with the ordinance on purpose that he may observe it. In the former case, whatever of error or of doubt or of responsibility belongs to it, it is his; in the latter case, it is ours. Were we prepared to do this, we would have no hesitation in receiving the unimmersed into the church. Until we are prepared to accept all the legitimate results of such a course, we should be careful about the first step. If it were *lawful,* we should have no hesitation to say it is *expedient.* It is the lawfulness of it we question, and not the expediency.

Communion Loaf. Why would not a loaf, or part of a loaf, of common raised bread be suitable for use in celebrating the Lord's Supper? M. E.

REDFIELD, Ia., Apr. 9, 1872.

We suppose it would, as the Scriptures give directions for no particular kind of loaf. But if any in the church insist on unleavened bread, there should be no trouble in yielding where the word of God does not bind us. The "loaf" referred to in the Scriptures was a mere wafer. It is well to be very scrupulous where God binds us to anything—as, for instance, that it should be bread and wine, and not flesh and milk. But when we become scrupulous as to the *kind* of bread—a matter in which God has left us without binding precept—we are in danger of being "righteous overmuch." In all such things let us study the things that make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

Communion, Who May Partake. Is it consistent for Christ's people to invite unimmersed persons to partake of the Lord's Supper?

Ought a preacher in the church of Christ to tell the people that it is the privilege of any one who feels that he is a child of God to partake of the Lord's Supper?

Are the deacons justifiable in passing the emblems of the Lord's body and shed blood to unimmersed persons?

A DISCIPLE.

It has always been a puzzle to us why this difficulty should always locate itself at the Lord's table. Why do we never get queries asking if it is consistent for Christians to invite unimmersed persons to pray, to give thanks, to preach, or to sing? These are all *Christian* duties, so far as Christian worship is concerned. Yet no one has ever asked, "Are the deacons justifiable in allowing an unimmersed person to sing, or in handing him a hymn-book?" or, "Should not the deacons take the hymn-book from him and stop his singing?" Let those who are troubled over the question apply their logic to such cases, and perhaps they may find that there are graver difficulties in the way of a solution than they had imagined. We see no more impropriety in a pious unimmersed person partaking of the Lord's Supper, than in such an one participating in praying or singing or any other act of Christian worship. The whole difficulty grows out of the confusion and disorder incident to a long residence in Babylon, and the *necessary* inconsistency and disorder attendant on efforts to get back to Jerusalem. While the transition lasts, there will be difficulties that logic will find it hard to settle; and they who have reached Jerusalem must not be forgetful that they, too, were once only on the way, and are not even yet sure that they are clean escaped from Babylon's influence. The *heart* as well as the *head* must be invoked in the settlement of such problems.

So far as the Lord's Supper is concerned, we know of no safer conclusion than that which our churches very generally have reached; namely, not to *invite* the unimmersed, but if any pious unimmersed persons come

on their own responsibility, not to judge or reject them.

Companion, Unbelieving. Please give a full and complete explanation of 1 Cor. 7:15: "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart," etc. D. E. GAIL.

It has reference to cases in which one party was a Christian, the other a heathen. They were cases in which both parties were originally heathen, but one had become converted to the Christ. The apostle taught that such marriages should be respected, and forbade the Christian wife or husband to forsake a heathen partner, if they could live in peace. But if the unbelieving party departed, he says, "Let him or her depart; a brother or sister is not in bondage in such cases"—that is, they were not bound to follow them, or to insist on living with them. They were at liberty to live apart. But they were not allowed to marry again. See 1 Cor. 7:14. The apostle evidently regards a separation as allowable in such cases, but not a new marriage.

Confirmation, Apostolic. Will you please explain for me, through your "Querists' Drawer," why it was necessary for the apostles Peter and John to be sent to Philip's converts for them to receive the Holy Ghost; and has it any bearing on confirmation? (Acts 8:12-17.) A SUBSCRIBER.

The reason was, that only by the apostles could miraculous powers be imparted. Excepting the immediate communication of miraculous endowments by the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:10)—designed to mark out Jews and Gentiles as equally entitled to the blessings of the gospel—the facts show that these gifts were only communicated by the laying on of the hands of the apostles. That miraculous gifts were what was conferred, is evident from the fact that Simon, witnessing it, said, "Give me also this *power,* that on whomso-

ever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit." This magician saw, in the gifts imparted, something vastly superior to his wonder-working—*real* miracles where his were only tricks; and if he had *such* a power, he could drive a better trade.

It has nothing to do with what is now called the rite of confirmation. A sufficient reason for so saying is, that those who now lay on hands, and say, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," never confer such gifts. No magician would offer them money for *their* power. Their claim is based on the wretched figment of apostolical succession and priestly mediation.

Conversion, Miraculous. Who was the first ecclesiastic of prominence or influence that taught the doctrine and necessity of "miraculous conversion," as held in later times by Arminius, Wesley and others, and now so generally advocated? And out of what, philosophically considered, did it take its origin?

LAFAYETTE, Ind. S. M. JEFFERSON.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to draw any line of separation between Arminians and Calvinists on this question. While, in respect to human co-operation in the matter of regeneration, the Synergists from Melancthon's time formed a class (as the advocates of irresistible grace had formed a distinct class under Augustine), yet this did not, except with Pelagians and Socinians, lead to a denial of miraculous conversion, but only to a denial of man's entire passivity in regeneration. While we have indications before Augustine's time of the doctrine, he is, we believe, the first ecclesiastic of note that set forth the doctrine of *irresistible grace* (*gratia irresistibilis*). He is the first to use the word *gratia* to denote the supernatural agency of God in conversion. He held this agency to be, in reality, *miraculous,* and therefore *irresistible.* In the earliest ages, as Augustine

himself acknowledges, there was no controversy on this subject. In the exhibition of this doctrine most of the first teachers contented themselves with that simplicity which prevails in the New Testament. They so express themselves, that while they affirm on one side that man receives assistance from divine grace, they still allow to him, on the other side, freedom of action. Nothing was said from the first to the third century about *irresistible* grace. Irenæus says, in many passages, that God compels no man; that we are free, and can choose good or evil. Clement of Alexandria says that God indeed *guides,* but never *binds,* our free wills; and that hence *to believe* and *to obey* is in man's power. Origen says we are indebted for faith to God alone. He gave us the means of faith. From him came both the faculties which man has of doing right, and the preservation of these faculties. But the use of these faculties bestowed on us depends on ourselves. Athanasius, Basilius the Great, Chrysostom, and other Fathers of the Greek church, agree to the views above expressed. But Augustine described divine grace as *efficax, sufficiens* and *irresistibilis.* He conceived grace to be the direct operation of divine omnipotence, acting in a miraculous manner. Just as Augustinianism prevailed over Pelagianism, this view obtained currency, and became in later times embodied in Calvinism. There were semi-Pelagian and semi-Augustinian theories which met with more or less favor, but they were constantly fluctuating in the hands of different speculative theologians.

The earlier Greek Fathers were led to emphasize the freedom of the will, because of their conflict with the views of man prevailing throughout the heathen world, and especially among the contemporary Gnostic sects. Augustinianism was a reaction from their teaching,

which, in controversy, sometimes ran into extremes in opposition to the Gnostics. We suppose the origin of Augustine's doctrine to be traceable, philosophically, to the doctrine of *original sin*. As infants were involved in this, and had to perish unless regenerated, infant baptism came into vogue as a means of infantile regeneration; and as this was a process without any freedom of will, and without any co-operation on the part of the subject, it had, logically, to be *a miracle* wrought by an irresistible power. This idea of regeneration prevailed along with the rest of Augustine's teaching. Although baptism was held to be the sacrament in which this blessing was conveyed, the blessing itself was the operation of the irresistible grace of God.

For the more modern phases of this question, the reader must refer to the Synergistic controversy from Melancthon's time onward. Synergism, in which Arminius and Wesley stand opposed to the irresistible grace of Augustine, did not deny the *miraculous* operations of grace, but only that they were *irresistible,* or that man was passive therein. Hence Whitefield, a Calvinist, and Wesley, an Arminian, are one in glorifying the miracles of grace wrought in the sudden and remarkable conversions under their ministry.

Three names, in modern times, are prominently associated with this doctrine of miraculous conversion: Wesley, Whitefield and Edwards.

John Wesley seems to have been led into a belief in miraculous conversions, not by any theological investigations, but by the occurrences under his own ministry. In this he was much more credulous and undiscriminating than his brother Charles. The latter looked with great distrust on these abnormal manifestations. Under date of June 4, 1740, he writes:

"To-day one came who was pleased to fall into a fit for my entertainment. He beat himself heartily: I thought it a pity to hinder him; so, instead of singing over him, as had often been done, we left him to recover at his leisure. A girl, as she began to cry, I ordered to be carried out. Her convulsions were so violent as to take away the use of her limbs, till they laid her without at the door, and left her; then she immediately found her legs and walked off. Some very unstill sisters, who always took care to stand near me, and tried who should cry loudest, since I have had them removed out of my sight have been as quiet as lambs. The first night I preached here, half my words were lost through the noise of their outcries. Last night, before I began, I gave public notice that whosoever cried so as to drown my voice, should, without any man's hurting or judging them, be gently carried to the farthest end of the room. But my porters had no employment the whole night. Yet the Lord was with us, mightily convincing of sin."

But with John it was different. In a letter to Samuel, who held all these manifestations in doubt, he writes:

"My dear brother, the whole question turns chiefly, if not wholly, *on matter of fact.* [It was not a philosophy at all, nor part of a system of theology, but simply what he saw and heard.—Ed.] You deny that God does now work these effects; at least, that he works them in such a manner. I affirm both, because I have heard these facts with my ears and seen them with my eyes. I have seen, as far as it can be seen, very many persons *changed in a moment* from the spirit of horror, fear and despair, to the spirit of hope, joy and peace; and from sinful desires, till then reigning over them, to a pure desire of doing the will of God. These are matters of fact,

whereof I have been, and almost daily am, eye or ear witness. This I know, several persons in whom this great change from the power of Satan unto God was wrought, *either in sleep,* or during a strong representation to the eye of their minds of Christ, either on the cross or in glory." After mentioning the change in their lives, he adds, "These are my living arguments for what I assert, that God now, as aforetime, gives remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost; which may be called visions."

In a conversation with the Bishop of Bristol, Mr. Wesley clearly states what he regards as the evidence of pardon. In reply to the question, "What do you mean by faith?" he says:

"My lord, by justifying faith I mean *a conviction wrought in a man by the Holy Spirit,* that Christ hath loved *him,* and given himself for *him,* and that through Christ *his* sins are forgiven."

Yet he was sometimes led to doubt the genuineness of these manifestations. Thus he says, at one time:

"A spirit of enthusiasm was breaking in upon many, who charged *their own imaginations* on *the will of God,* and that *not written, but impressed on their hearts.* If these *impressions* be received as the rule of action, instead of the *written word,* I know nothing so wicked or absurd but we may fall into, and that without remedy."

When Mr. Wesley *reasoned* on the subject in the light of Scripture, he insisted on the test of *the written word;* but when he was in the midst of these scenes of religious excitement, he was led to believe that it was the work of the Holy Ghost, and his ideas of conversion seemed to have been shaped rather on what he saw, than on what he read in the Scriptures.

Jonathan Edwards says concerning the revival in

Northampton and other places in New England, as early as 1741-2:

"The months of August and September were the most remarkable of any this year, for appearances of the conviction and conversion of sinners, and great revivings, quickenings and comfort of professors, and for extraordinary external effects of these things. It was a very frequent thing to see an house full of outcries, faintings, convulsions, and such like, both with distress, and also with admiration and joy. It was not the manner here to hold meetings all night, as in some places, nor was it common to continue them till very late in the night; but it was pretty often so, that there were some that were so affected, and their bodies so overcome, that they could not go home, but were obliged to stay all night where they were."

It will be seen that it was not a difference between Calvinism and Arminianism; Edwards, Whitefield and Wesley all have the same accompaniments to their respective ministries, and all accept them as tokens of the presence and power of the Spirit of God working miraculous conversions.

Our own opinion is that so far as we are to treat this question philosophically, it will be found that this theory and practice were always the result of a *reaction from formalism and rationalism.* This is seen in the growth of Mysticism at certain times; in the Pietism that was a reaction from the formalism and corruption of Lutheranism; in the Quakerism and Methodism that reacted against the extreme formalism of the Church of England; and in the revivals in New England in Edwards' time, in Virginia among the Baptists, in Kentucky among the Presbyterians—all extreme revolts against coldness, formality and deadness. It is, we think, easy

to account for the reaction in all these cases; but why it should take on this particular form of miraculous conversion, must be explained in the light of theological convictions touching original sin, total depravity and irresistible grace, reaching back to Augustine's time, and even to an earlier period.

Corner-stone Laying. Is it right for the Disciples of Christ to lay a corner-stone for a house to worship God in, under the Christian dispensation, knowing that Christ is the chief corner-stone? LEVIN WOODS.

HURRICANE, Warren Co., Miss.

The foregoing will seem to many to be a trifling question; but it indicates a conscientiousness that ought not to be treated lightly. Let us say to our querist that Christ is not the chief corner-stone of a house to worship in; he is the chief corner-stone of the spiritual temple, which is not made of wood, or brick, or stone, but of "living stones"—of believers in Christ Jesus. A house to worship in is a mere convenience—not a divine ordinance. It were as sensible to say that since the spiritual temple is "built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets," therefore a house of worship should not have a foundation at all! A house of worship should have a good foundation. And if it has a stone foundation, it will have a chief corner-stone; and this chief corner-stone must be *laid*. Whether laid with any special ceremony or not, is a question to be decided by those who build it. We see no wrong in it, but if it is likely to be an occasion of trouble, it is not worth striving about.

Covenant-breaking. A brother owes the church quite a large sum of money, and refuses payment; is it the duty of the church to withdraw fellowship from him, or is it not? If it is their duty, and they withdraw fellowship, would it be right to compel him by the law of the land to pay said sum of money?

1. If it was a debt voluntarily and personally contracted on his part, and the church, on the strength of his promise to pay, has incurred obligations to others, plainly it is a breach of faith and a violation of covenant amounting to immorality. If he can not be brought to repentance, he is in danger of the judgment. How long the church should exercise forbearance in such a case, must depend on considerations which forbid an expression of opinion on our part in respect to any particular case. In general terms we would say that, when all hope of reformation is past, and the refusal amounts to a defiance of the authority of the church, it would be wholesome discipline to disown the incorrigible offender.

2. If the church has incurred debt on the strength of his promise to pay, and is unable otherwise to pay the debt, we see not why it would not be just to enforce the demand of justice for the sake of those to whom the money is justly due. But if the church is able to meet the demand, we judge it better to suffer wrong and be defrauded than to encourage in the least degree a litigious spirit. "*As far as lieth in you,* live peaceably with all men."

Covenant-breaking. Two members of the church sign a writing that they will abide the decision or award of arbitrators. One finds the award unjust and appeals to the courts. Is he a covenant-breaker? Outside of this writing all parties agreed that the arbitrators should lay aside every other thing and try the case by the Bible.

He is clearly a covenant-breaker. We do not see why there should be the slightest doubt of this. He made an agreement, signed it, and then violated it. He did not sign an agreement to abide the decision *if it pleased him*, but an agreement to abide the decision *whatever it might be*. The fact that he considers the award unjust has

nothing to do with his obligation; the power to decide what is just or unjust in the case passed out of his hands when he agreed to deliver it over to arbitrators. All that is left to him is to keep his word by accepting their decision. If he thinks the decision unjust, let him remember what is said of the man that God approves: "He that sweareth to his own hurt *and changeth not*" (Ps. 15:4).

Covenants, New vs. Old. In your review of Bro. Lhamon's address on the Bible, you say, substantially, there is danger of underrating the value of the Old Testament. This causes me to ask two or three questions.

1. Does not the introduction of the New Covenant abolish the Old (Heb. 8:13; 8:7; Gal. 4:21-31)?

2. If so, are all the books contained in what we call the Old Testament taken out of the way? If not, why not?

3. What spiritual benefit can result from the study of Judges, Kings, Chronicles, etc.?

4. Is there anything spiritual in the Song of Solomon? If so, what is it?

5. What do we mean by inspiration? Is not all truth from God, and therefore given by inspiration, and "profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work"? W. A. MELOAN.

CARROLLTON, MO.

1. Yes; it abolishes its *authority,* but that does not destroy its character as a *divine revelation.* See Heb. 1:1, 2. The entire Epistle to the Hebrews is based on this proposition.

2. Everything that rested on the authority of Moses as lawgiver, and all that appertained thereunto, is taken out of the way, so far as its being a rule of life is concerned. But because when the sun shines the light of the moon is obscured, does it follow that the light of the moon is not God-given?

3. Much more spiritual benefit than we can here take space to speak of. (1) As containing a history of the unfoldings of God's purposes. (2) As presenting *studies of character*—pictures drawn to the life of men and women; such sketches as, in their severe truthfulness, are nowhere else to be found. (3) As furnishing links in the chain of Messiah's progenitorship. (4) Would we be as well off, think you, without the history of David and Solomon, Elijah and Elisha? What about Paul's illustrations of faith in Hebrews 11, if these ancient records were cast away? And what about our Lord's allusions to the Queen of Sheba, the glory of Solomon, the men of Nineveh, etc.? And what about his instruction to "search the scriptures"?

4. We do not know that there is. But they are not without their value.

5. Yes, all truth is from God; but it does not follow that every man that speaks truth speaks by inspiration. There is some truth in Ingersoll's lectures. Our correspondent would hardly argue that *therefore* Ingersoll is divinely inspired. There are truths discoverable by observation, and truths sought out by reason. No inspiration is needed to ascertain these truths. But there are truths not discernible by reason or observation—such as the nature and character of God; his feelings towards our sinful race; the means of man's recovery from sin; the conditions of salvation; the destiny of man; the connection between character and destiny, etc. And in a revelation of these truths *through* men, *to* men, in human language, there is needed a divine influence—a supernatural enlightenment—such as will enable those who are chosen as God's messengers to receive and communicate a knowledge of God's will, and of the truth that saves. This we call inspiration. These truths, once revealed,

may be learned by the proper exercise of reason, without inspiration in the learner; but it required inspiration in the revealer. Hence, Jesus promised to the apostles the Spirit of truth to guide them into all truth.

While all truth can be made tributary to our moral and spiritual interests, it is not correct to say that all truth is profitable for doctrine, etc., in the sense in which the apostle uses these words. Astronomical truth, for instance, does not fit us thoroughly unto all good works; nor does the partial truth, mixed with error, taught by heathen sages, so fit us. Truth, flowing direct'y from a divine fountain, is a very different thing from truth as found in a muddy stream, polluted by the washings of earth; and truth as deduced by man's reason, always liable to err, can not compare with truth spoken by holy men under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Creation, Moses' Account. Please answer in the "Querists' Drawer" the following question, which has been partly suggested by your delightful "Evenings with the Bible," viz.: Is there sufficient reason for arriving at the conclusion that Moses was an untrue historian, and that he contradicted his own statements? Compare Gen. 1:3-5, inclusive, with verses 14-19 inclusive, of same chapter, relative to the fact as to whether it was the first or fourth day upon which light was created. Some of the Ingersoll school in this locality think there is.

EAST RICHLAND, O. J. G. MCFARLAND.

In answer, we quote the following from an essay on "The Mosaic Record of Creation," by Rev. A. McCaul, D. D., found in "Aids to Faith," p. 242, American edition:

"'Light and the measurement of time are represented before the manifestation of the sun, and this idea, although repugnant to our modern knowledge, has not in former times appeared absurd,' is the objection of *Essays and Reviews;* and, as is evident, is not the result of

modern science, having been broached already by Celsus. As, however, recent writers give modern science the credit of it, it becomes necessary to ask, What does modern science teach with regard to the relative ages of the earth and the sun? The answer is, Nothing, absolutely nothing, as a scientific certainty. Whether sun and earth were created simultaneously, and in their present relations—or whether the earth, already created, wandered within the range of solar attraction; or whether, after the sun existed, the earth was called forth within that range—science does not know. It has, however, without any reference to the Book of Genesis, proposed a theory, which has been accepted by some of the most scientific men of these days as highly probable. Had it been derived for the express purpose of removing the supposed difficulties of the Mosaic account, it could hardly have been more to the purpose. It supposes that the whole solar system was originally one mass of vapory or nebulous matter, which, according to the laws of gravitation, assumed the form of an immense sphere. This sphere received (from without) an impulse which caused it to revolve on its axis from west to east. In consequence of this revolving motion, it became flattened at the poles and swollen in the equatorial region, and in consequence of the greatness of the centrifugal force at the equator, and the contemporaneous condensation and contraction of the nebulous mass, a free revolving ring, similar to that of Saturn, detached itself in the region of the equator. This ring not being of uniform density, and in consequence of contraction, broke in one or more places, and these fragments, in obedience to the laws of gravitation, became a sphere or spheres—that is, a planet or planets—all necessarily revolving from west to east round the parent mass. Another ring was formed in like

manner, and another planet came into existence, and so on until the whole solar system was complete. A similar process took place with regard to some of the planets, and thus they got their moons.

"Now, according to this theory, not only the earth, but all the planets of our system, existed before the sun in its present condition. As these planets are not now self-illuminating, it may be supposed that the rings, when detached from the original nebulous mass, were dark also, and therefore that the equatorial matter of the parent nebulous sphere of which they were composed was also devoid of light—that therefore the sun did not receive its luminous atmosphere until all the planets had been detached. But until this luminous atmosphere existed, they could not derive their light from the sun. If, on the other hand, it be supposed that these detached rings were luminous, and that the planets formed from them were luminous also, then the planets had a light of their own, independent of the sun. But however that be, so much follows from this theory, that the earth existed before the residuary parent globe could be called the sun, or could perform its office of luminary to the system. If the earth, therefore, had light during this period, it must have been derived from some other source. That this is possible can not now be denied. The discoveries with regard to heat, combustion, electricity, galvanism show that there may be light independent of the sun. It is also now generally received that the sun is itself an opaque body, and that solar light proceeds from a luminous atmosphere by which it is surrounded. (The wonderful discoveries of Kirchoff and others in solar chemistry are supposed by some to confirm La Place's theory, and to prove that the earth was before the sun, and had a light of its own.) The progress of science

has, therefore, neutralized the objection that light could not exist before the sun. Indeed, it has done more—it has proved the accuracy of the Mosaic language. Moses does not call the sun *'Or,* light,' but *'Maor,* a place or instrument of light,' a luminary, or candlestick, just what modern science has discovered it to be. Thus, so far is the Mosaic doctrine of light from being opposed to recent discoveries, that if Moses had wished to describe the modern doctrine concerning light, he could not have expressed himself more happily. Scripture does not say that God created the light, or made it, but said, 'Let it be, and it was!'

"If, then, light be not a separate and definite body, but only vibrations or undulations of ether, somehow set in motion, the sacred writer could not have expressed its appearance in words more beautiful or more agreeable to truth.

"Now, this theory of La Place may or may not be true, but it is an offspring of modern science, and implies, just like the Mosaic account, the pre-existence of the earth before the sun became the luminary of the system. It does, indeed, also imply the pre-existence of the great parent nebulous globe, but this is not contrary to the Mosaic account; Moses does not say that the body of the sun or moon and stars were created on the fourth day, but, according to the Hebrew, 'God said, Let there be light-holders in the firmament of heaven, . . . and let them be for light-holders in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and God made the two great light-holders, . . . and God gave them in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth, and the stars.' The Hebrew word *asah,* make, may signify 'make ready, prepare, dress' (see Gesenius' Lexicon, in verb). The creation of the sun or parent globe may be included in

verse 1, and the work of the fourth day consisted in furnishing it with its luminous atmosphere. When this took place, and the sun began to shed its light, then the moon, and the earth's fellow-planets, 'the stars,' of verse 16, became luminaries also. Having thus seen how modern science proves that the earth and light might exist, and, according to scientific theory, probably did exist, before the sun, it is no longer difficult to conceive how these might also be a measure of time."

Creature, The, Made Subject to Vanity. 1. In Rom. 8: 19-21, what is meant by the creature or creation referred to?

2. What is the vanity to which it was unwillingly subjected?

3. What is the glory in the future to which it is to be restored? S. C. S.

Poe, Pa.

It would require much more space than we can give, even to state the various interpretations of this difficult text. We can only briefly indicate what we deem to be the meaning of the writer. The following separate considerations will be sufficient to point out what we consider the true line of thought:

1. *Ktisis* should be rendered uniformly by the word *creation* in this connection.

2. The sentiment of the text is expressed rhetorically, almost poetically; the terms employed must be interpreted in harmony with this style.

3. The real question under discussion is that of *sufferings*—their place and meaning in the divine economy. The Jewish Christians, who had been educated to believe, according to their law, that sufferings were a mark of God's displeasure, were sorely perplexed to know why, as Christians, they should suffer so, when they were consciously obedient to the will of God.

4. With this problem before him, Paul points them to

the significant fact that *suffering is a part of the present order of things*—that the "whole creation" (a term not to be too strictly and literally defined, but meaning the present system of things—created things, animate and inanimate—the old creation, as distinct from the new creation in Christ Jesus, present and prospective) gives tokens of incompleteness, disorder and unrest; and even Christians, as yet a part of it, share in this. The decay of vegetation, the suffering and death of animals, the sweep of the tempest, the blast of the lightnings, the heavings of the earthquake, the reign of famine and pestilence, and, more than all, the unsatisfying life of man, abounding in disappointments, toils, calamities and marked by ruined hopes, crushed ambitions, and lost loves—all these show that the whole creation shares in a general subjection to "vanity," or instability—liability to decay and corruption. But Paul does not take a gloomy view of this. He regards it as subjected to vanity, *"in hope;"* that is, the divine ordainer of this present unsatisfying state of things looks beyond it—has an ultimate purpose in it to evolve a more desirable destiny. Hence the writer practically represents the whole creation as bearing in the bosom of its present disorders a beautiful prophecy of new heavens and a new earth. He says, "The eager expectation of the creation is ardently awaiting the revelation of the sons of God." *Karadokein* means *to expect with uplifted head. Apokaradokia* indicates a *persistent* expectation. It is the uniform and ceaseless outlook of nature toward a better state of things. As, in former geological periods, the creation was looking towards new evolutions, and prophesying, in all her incomplete arrangements, something better to come; so now the creation is eagerly looking toward a regeneration of the heavens and the earth, when God will

"make all things new." In verse 22 Paul represents the creation as bearing in its womb a new life and a new order of things, and the sufferings of the present are but the birth-throes of anguish preparatory to the emergence of a new creation. It appears to us that, without pressing terms too literally, there is no difficulty in gathering the general sentiment that the present state of things is not final, but must be interpreted in view of what is to come.

So universal is this reign of disorder and suffering, that even Christians, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit (mark, the firstfruits, the earnest, not the full inheritance), are not exempt from it. They belong yet to the present state of things, and share its sorrows. They are redeemed but in part, and await the redemption of the body, the full blessings of adoption. When "the liberty of the glory of the sons of God" shall be realized, the whole creation will be readjusted, so that the time of man's full redemption will be the era of creation's rejuvenation. As Peter says, "We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell."

Those who look here for a proof of universal salvation, or of the immortality of animals, seem to us to torture the text. No such thought is under consideration. *Suffering* is the question, and out of suffering into blessedness the doctrine. In a poetical conception of the creation as groaning, travailing, and eagerly expecting the birth of a new order of things, the apostle sets forth the general truth that God intended, in subjecting the creation to its present conditions, to work out through unrest and change and suffering a future of glory and blessedness. Of this final inheritance Christians enjoy the earnest in the possession of the Holy Spirit.

Dead Sea, Typical. In your lesson paper for January—page 5—we find this language: "Among the typical significances of this wonderful narrative drawn out by commentators, none has been more striking than that the angry Jordan, sweeping through Palestine into the dismal Dead Sea, is a type of death. Hence we speak of the 'River and Valley of Death.' As Joshua led Israel from the wilderness through Jordan into the Holy Land, so Jesus leads his faithful followers safely through death into their everlasting inheritance."

Now, if it be true, as I understand you to teach, that the Jordan was a type of the "River of Death," and the land of promise a type of heaven, are we to understand that when Jesus shall lead the host of the redeemed across the deep, dark river, they will encounter foes as did the armies of Israel when they entered the Holy Land, and be compelled to drive out their enemies?

If you were teaching a Bible class and your pupils should ask you to prove that Joshua was a type of Christ, the river Jordan a type of death, and the Holy Land a type of heaven itself, how would you proceed? J. W. I.

It is well to have close and cautious scrutiny in respect to alleged types, since fanciful analogies may often be readily traced where no type was intended, and the Bible may thus be made merely a curious book furnishing material for the most extravagant conceits of allegorists. But, on the other hand, there *are* types and allegories—divinely taught to be such—which are really instructive and deeply interesting. We are safe on the question of types as long as we adhere to the New Testament interpretations of Old Testament institutions and events. What, then, is the teaching of the New Testament on the points in question?

1. Paul teaches concerning the deliverance of Israel from Egypt and their journey through the wilderness, that "all these things happened unto them for types, and are written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the [Jewish] ages are come" (1 Cor. 10:1-11). Although

it did not suit Paul's immediate purpose to carry the analogy further, there is such a want of completeness in ending it where he does that the reader is at once set on tracing it out to a more symmetrical finish. The Epistle to the Hebrews gives assistance in this. We there learn that a gospel of *rest* was preached to the Israelites. It was not merely a gospel of salvation from bondage in Egypt, but it contained a promise of *rest* (Heb. 4: 1, 2). But it was only a *typical,* not a *final,* rest. Hence "if Joshua had given them [the true] rest, then God would not have spoken afterward of another day" (v. 8). Hence we learn

1. That in the typical gospel there was a *rest* for the people.

2. That that rest was in the land of Canaan.

3. That Joshua led them into that rest. The Old Testament shows that his name was changed, in view of the place he was to fill as the leader of the people; so that his very name identifies him as a significant type of *our* Joshua.

4. That this rest but foreshadowed the true rest that remains for the people of God; and consequently the leader into that rest was but a type of him who leads us to the heavenly rest.

5. All this being so, we are shut up to the necessity of interpreting Jordan—the last obstacle to the entrance into the land of rest—as typical of death. Although it is not expressly mentioned as a type, it is so necessarily implied that the conclusion is unavoidable. It is not a mere fancy.

There is no force in the objection raised by our querist as to the enemies found in the land of Canaan. A type, like a parable, is not meant to be typical in all its details, incidents or decorations. Because Jesus men-

tions five wise and five foolish virgins (Matt. 25), it does not follow that the saved and the lost are to be equal in number; that is not the point in the parable. The point in the type is that of *rest* after toil and wandering. This the Israelites obtained, but it was not *perfect* rest; hence Paul argues from this very fact that it was only a typical rest, and that the true and perfect rest is yet future. The very objection which our querist brings is the first which Paul employs to prove that it was a typical and not a real rest.

Dead, State of. What is the meaning of Ps. 146:4, and Eccl. 9:5, 6, 10? Here it is said of the dead that their thoughts have perished, that they know not anything, that they have no more a reward, and that there is no work, device, knowledge nor wisdom in the grave, which I suppose simply means, in the state of death. Materialists claim these passages to teach that at physical death all life is extinguished and that the dead are unconscious until brought to life again at the resurrection.

Also Mal. 4:1-3. Materialists with much assurance claim this to teach the utter annihilation of the wicked at the final judgment. If they are wrong in this, what do you understand the passages to teach? How would you meet them? S.

1. It is always unsafe to be led by the mere sound of words, and to apply them to something for which they were never intended, merely because they chance to express what suits our purpose. Thus in Ps. 146:5 the writer is speaking of *princes*. His doctrine is, "Put not your trust in princes." The reason he gives is, they are *mortal*—they will soon die, and in the grave they are utterly unable to fulfill their princely purposes. He does not say that such a one will think no more in the future world, but that his thoughts, as of one to be trusted for earthly help, will perish. It does not touch the question which our querist refers to.

2. In Ecclesiastes, an argument is carried on in refer-

ence to life and death, and what is the supreme good. Various views are presented and urged in the course of the argument. To take these as a final settlement of so grave a question is absurd. Take, for instance, chap. 3: 18-22, and urge it as a final utterance of truth on this subject, and what havoc will be made with all Christian ideas of life: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they all have one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity." The truth is, this is said at an early stage of a protracted argument, and was not meant to be final. So with the texts quoted by our querist. They treat of death as it stands related to this life according to the observation of our senses. The question is not about the consciousness of the spirit after death, but about life and death as viewed from an earthly standpoint. The question of the future life is never fully treated in the Old Testament, and certainly not in this book. Materialists themselves ought to see this; for the declaration concerning the dead (Eccl. 9: 5), "neither have they any more reward," shuts them out from all future judgment and retribution. It means clearly that they have no more a reward *here,* as relates to human life in this world; and from the same point of view the whole connection must be interpreted.

3. This is another specimen of this vicious style of text interpretation. It relates to a "great and terrible day of the Lord" which was to be preceded by the appearance of Elijah (vs. 5, 6) and of the Messiah (v. 2). See also chap. 3: 1. The reference in this calam-

ity is clearly to the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish nation—the baptism in fire of which John the Baptist forewarned them. It would be indeed a beautiful and precious heaven in which the saints should walk in the ashes of the wicked!

Death of Our Lord. If possible, or if you think profitable, I would be pleased to see printed in the *Mentor* or STANDARD the reasons Dr. Stroud gives that the Lord died of a broken heart. The thought was new to me, but I can see two reasons, and am very willing to accept it. D. C. BARBER.

DENVER, Ill.

The argument can not be given in full here. But the following is a summary of it, given by Rev. F. Johnson, D. D., in one of the publications of the American Bible Union:

1. Jesus did not die a *mere* crucifixion, for the period of his suffering was too brief. Moreover, the crucified usually died under a lingering process of exhaustion and faintness, but Jesus was able to cry with a loud voice, and spoke once and again within a few minutes of his death.

2. Mental emotions are well known to affect the heart, and when in overwhelming excess they occasionally produce rupture of its walls. The blood is received faster than it can be expelled, and the organ is torn in the violence of its own action.

3. The bloody sweat of Gethsemane was such as may be produced by violent action of the heart under the influence of emotion. Numerous instances of it have occurred. Its occurrence in the garden shows that the heart of Jesus was, even then, under a weight of agony less than that endured upon the cross, excited to intense activity.

4. The symptoms attending the death of Jesus were

such as to indicate rupture of the heart. The strength up to the last moment, the piercing and convulsive shriek, and the speedy death following it, are characteristic of this injury.

5. In cases of rupture of the heart, the blood flows into the surrounding sac, and, after death, is separated into red clot and limpid serum, or blood and water. The blood and water (John 19: 34) which came forth after the spear which pierced our Lord's body, may be accounted for on the supposition that his death was immediately produced by a rupture of the heart. It is admitted by the highest medical authority that they can be accounted for in no other manner.

6. If we accept this theory, it will still remain true that Jesus was crucified and slain by his foes, since in the hatred of those whom he came to bless he saw the sin of our race which he came to bear; since in the ignominious and painful subjection to the cross, he met the curse which he came to remove; and since, without the hatred of his foes, and the torture of the thorns, the scourge, the cross, the shame, sapping the powers of his body and representing to his mind the burden of woe which he came to remove, he would not have died. The mental agonies of his last hours, which began in Gethsemane, were associated with his crucifixion and had reference to it.

Death and Soul-sleeping. In 1 Tim. 6: 16 are three expressions, to each of which I would like you to give a brief explanation. They are:

1. "Who only hath immortality."

NOTE 1.—Is there any ground in this for the soul-sleeping or Thomasite doctrine?

NOTE 2.—What is its true meaning?

2. "Dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto."

3. "Whom no man hath seen, nor can see." SOUTH.

1. God.

Note 1. None whatever.

Note 2. Justin Martyr well expresses it: "God is said only to have immortality, because he hath it not by the will of another, as the rest who possess it, but of his own proper essence." All other immortality is *derived*. It does not follow that none others are immortal, for he who is immortal in himself may *bestow* immortality on others. Hence, men may be immortal in spirit and mortal in body. In Rev. 15:4 we read, "For thou only art holy." Does it follow that there are no saints or holy ones? Certainly not. But their holiness is *derived*. God is essentially holy.

2. Just what is said is meant. No mortal man can approach into the light of God. He can scarcely gaze upon the light of the sun.

3. See John 1:18. This was one of the reasons why God was manifest in flesh—that we might behold, in this subdued form, his glory.

It is possible that the language is meant to convey the idea that under no circumstances can created beings look upon God in his unveiled glory. In that case the language of the Apocalypse, "they shall see his face," must be understood to spring from the fact of persons being admitted to see the face of an Oriental monarch, as an evidence of peculiar favor, and to express simply the idea of intimate fellowship.

Death Sentence by the Jews. How do you reconcile John 18:31 with 19:7; the Jews claiming in one that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, and, in the other, according to their law, he ought to die? W. L.

It was not lawful *according to the Roman law* for the Jews to put any man to death; for the Jews were now a conquered people, and the power to capitally punish was

taken away from them. But according to their own law the blasphemer was to be punished with death. This was why they changed the charge from blasphemy to treason when they took Jesus before the Roman procurator, because on a charge of blasphemy, as defined by their own law, they could not get a sentence of death from a Roman court; but on a charge of treason, as defined by Roman law, they could.

Decalogue—Is it Binding? I am seeking after the truth, or the way by which to be an heir of God, but there are some things that are contained in the Scriptures that bother me, of which I want a Scriptural explanation.

Are the ten commandments which were given of God through Moses binding on us to-day? It seems to me they are, for the following reasons: If given of God, why should he allow his laws to be changed? I can't see where Christ changed them, as Christ is the only way to be saved; and if they are not changed, why is the Sabbath day changed? W. B.

Why does a parent change his laws and his methods of dealing with his children? Not because *he* changes, but because their growth and development requires a different treatment. He unchangeably adheres to the same principle; namely, to do the very best he can for his children; and in unchangeably adhering to this *purpose,* he necessarily changes his *methods* of instructing them. See Gal. 3:23; 4:7.

God gave circumcision, sacrifice, various feasts, fasts, etc., which are no longer of force; their object has been accomplished and they have been withdrawn. So of the law of Moses as a whole. It was given for a certain purpose. See Gal. 3:19. Its purpose was accomplished and it passed away. So of the Levitical priesthood. See Heb. 7:11, 12. Nothing that is essentially moral or spiritual changes, but the methods of presenting and teaching may change according to circumstances.

Because God is unchangeable, does it follow that spring can not change to summer, or summer to autumn? Certainly not. So God may be unchangeable in causing the Jewish to succeed to the patriarchal, and the Christian to the Jewish economy. God is unchangeable, not because he always does the same things, but because he always acts on the same principles.

Dedications. By what authority do our preaching brethren dedicate our new houses of worship? and by what authority does a brother in reporting such dedications say, "I dedicated to the Lord," etc.?

In purchasing new hymn-books, should they be dedicated, and by whom?

Is property so dedicated, consecrated to the Lord? If so, is any ceremony necessary when such property is sold for other purposes?

What would constitute an appropriate ceremony in laying a corner-stone for a new house for religious worship? and is it in keeping with the dedication service? S. R. NELSON.

To dedicate is *to set apart to a sacred use.* There is the same authority for setting a house apart that there is for building it. It is desirable to have a house to meet in; and it is desirable to keep it for this special purpose. It is "lovely and of good report" to have a place of worship undefiled and undisturbed by any associations of business or amusement—not because God will accept our worship any more readily, but because we can more readily worship in spirit and in truth under such circumstances. As to any particular *form* of dedicatory service, there is no authority save what is found in the fitness of things. We do not sing merry songs at a funeral, nor mournful ones at a wedding. Hymns and prayers suitable for the morning are not always suitable for the evening. Special occasions call for special services, and in this there is nothing more than a due regard to *decency,*

order and *edification,* with reference to which all things, Paul says, should be done.

It no more follows, because we dedicate a house to the Lord, that we should never sell it to go elsewhere, than it follows, because we dedicate our bodies to the Lord, that they must always remain the same bodies and never give forth their material for other uses. The means invested in the house should be held sacred for such use and be reinvested when it is found that the prosperity of Zion requires the change.

If any one wishes to dedicate a hymn-book, we know not that any one has a right to interfere with it. To his own Master he stands or falls—and so of dedicatory services at the opening of a house of worship, or at the laying of a corner-stone. Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind.

No brother ought to say, "I dedicated a house to the Lord," when he has acted simply as the agent of the church.

While there is a fitness in special services for special occasions, we should be careful to guard against a superstitious regard to times and places, as if all places and all times should not be hallowed to the Lord.

Depravity. 1. Are little children "by nature the children of wrath"? If not, how came they heirs to life eternal?

2. Is the Holy Ghost a person? Is it also an influence? How shall we distinguish between it as an influence and a person?

3. In what sense may the Holy Ghost be said to dwell in the Word, when that Word is said to be the sword of the Spirit?

PLATTEVILLE, Wis. CHAS. H. CANFIELD.

1. This phrase, as employed in Eph. 2:3, has, we judge, no reference to little children. Macknight says on this text:

"*Nature* often signifies one's birth and education. Gal. 2:15: 'We who are Jews by nature.' Also men's natural reason and conscience. Rom. 2:14: 'The Gentiles who have not a law, do by nature the things of the law.' Also the general sense and practice of mankind. 1 Cor. 11:14: 'Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair,' etc. Also, the original constitution of anything. Gal. 4:8: 'Who are not gods by nature.' Also, a disposition formed by custom or habit. Thus, Demetrius Phalerius said of the Lacedemonians, 'The Lacedemonians by nature speak shortly.' In the passage under consideration, *nature* is that second corrupt nature which men form in themselves, by habitually indulging vicious inclinations; for the apostle speaks of men's being 'by nature children of wrath' as the effect of having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh."

Whitby's note is equally explicit:

"The circumstances of the text demonstrate that the apostle here intendeth no such thing (as original sin), because he speaks of persons dead in (actual) trespasses and sins, in which in times past they had walked, according to the course of the (heathen) world and the suggestions of Satan; of men who had their conversation in times past in the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were, *on that account,* the children of wrath, as well as other heathens. And, therefore, *Suidas,* agreeably to the context, saith that *nature* is here put for *customary practice,* according to the frequent import of that word in profane authors—in Philo, in whom *custom* is a *nature opposite to truth;* and in our common proverb, that *custom is a second nature.* His words are these: 'When the apostle saith, we are by nature the children of wrath, he saith not this according to the proper acceptance of the word *nature,* for then he had

cast the blame on the author of nature; but he understood by it a long and evil custom.' "

Little children are so far involved in the curse of the first sin, that they die in consequence of it (Rom. 5: 14). And as life eternal involves a glorified body, they are the subjects of the redeeming power of Christ in their resurrection from the dead (Rom. 5: 17-19, 21).

2. Yes, the Holy Spirit is as clearly represented as a person as is the Father, or the Son, in the baptismal formula. The word "person," however, is apt to mislead those not accustomed to nice discriminations. How distinguish between the Father and his influence, or the Son and his influence? There is no more difficulty in this case than in those. It may not always be possible or necessary to distinguish between a person and his influence, since the latter is but the assertion of the power of the former. But when we are told that we are *born of the Spirit,* and also that we are *born of the word,* we know that the birth is the result of the influence put forth by the Spirit through the word of truth which he has revealed.

3. In no sense, so far as that metaphor is concerned, any more than the maker of a sword can be said to dwell in the sword. The sword is *furnished* by the Spirit to be *wielded* by the Christian soldier. When the word of God is spoken of as *seed,* the Spirit may be said to dwell in it as the vitalizing presence and power of God dwell in the seed.

Dismissal, Letter of. Has a local church the right to give a member a letter of dismissal, and thus dismiss him from the congregation without his signifying an intention to unite with any other congregation? If so, what relation does a person so dismissed sustain to the kingdom of Christ?

A YOUNG OVERSEER.

Such a proceeding is certainly irregular, and we do not see how it is to be justified. It should be known, before a letter is given, whether he intends to unite with another congregation. If not, a certificate of his moral and religious standing may be given, if demanded; but if it is known that he is actually withdrawing from the church under cover of a letter of honorable dismissal, the certificate should state the fact, condemn such a course, and state that after due admonition the church had withdrawn from him for disorderly conduct.

Divine Sovereignty. There are some honest inquirers in my neighborhood who, on account of their education, are much troubled on the questions of divine sovereignty and unconditional personal election. They request from you an exposition of Rom. 9:20, 21: "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" STUDENT.

As Paul's illustration of divine sovereignty is borrowed from the Old Testament, it will be wise to refer to the original source, and learn what is there taught. Let the reader turn to Jer. 18:1-10. He will read as follows:

"The word which came to Jeremiah from the LORD, saying, Arise and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter: so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.

"Then the word of the LORD came to me, saying, O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.

"At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."

Here please to observe:

1. It was the *same lump* of clay which, originally intended by the potter for one kind of a vessel, was marred in his hands, *and its destiny was changed.* The potter exercised his sovereignty in *changing its destiny.* "So he made it again another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make it."

2. That election and reprobation are here set forth, is clear; but notice—

(1) It is not *personal* election and reprobation, but the election and reprobation of *nations.* "*O house of Israel,* can not I do with *you* as this potter?" "At what instant I speak concerning *a nation,* and concerning a *kingdom,*" etc.

(2) It is not election to *eternal life,* nor reprobation to eternal damnation. "If I speak concerning a nation, or a kingdom, to pluck up, to pull down, and to destroy it, . . . or to build and to plant it." It is, then, the appointment of peoples or nations to prosperity and power, for the accomplishment of such purposes as the Lord desires to accomplish through such an instrumentality; and the casting down of a nation from such prosperity and power when it fails to fulfill its purpose.

(3) It is not *unconditional* election or reprobation, for *if* is the pivot on which everything turns. "*If* that

nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, *I will repent* of the evil that I thought to do unto them." "*If* it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, *I will repent* of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." It can not be made clearer than this language makes it, that these national elections and reprobations were *conditional*, and that God's conduct towards them was to be regulated by their conduct towards him. God's unchangeability would be shown, not in always *doing the same things*, but in always *acting on the same principles* of righteousness. See this illustrated in the case of Nineveh, in the Book of Jonah. The same immutable righteousness that leads him to build up and establish the nation that walks in his ways, leads him to pluck up, pull down and destroy that same nation when it does evil in his sight and obeys not his voice. In other words, if the vessel is marred in his hands, he makes it into another vessel, destined to another use.

Now, as for Paul's use of this illustration, note:

1. That God had spoken good concerning the house of Israel, to build, to plant, to establish it. The Old Testament so abounds in proof of this, that no special quotations need be made.

2. That God had spoken evil concerning the idolatrous Gentile nations, to pluck up and to destroy.

3. That the Jews did evil in his sight, and obeyed not his voice; and he was now about to destroy them.

4. That the Gentile nations were now showing a disposition to turn from their idols and listen to that gospel which the Jews rejected; and, God, who had so long cast them off, was now disposed to do them good by sending the gospel of salvation to them. That this is what the apostle had in his mind, is evident from the following verses:

"What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath [the unbelieving Jews] fitted to destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory [by all the means employed through ages to prepare the way for the coming of Christ Jesus to offer salvation to all nations], even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people which were not my people, and her beloved, which was not beloved" (Rom. 9:22-25).

The Jews were, indeed, "fitted to destruction" long before their destruction; but as, through them, the Messiah was to come, God "endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" until "the fulness of time was come." Their cup of iniquity overflowed in the rejection of the Messiah, and they were cast off, plucked up, and destroyed, and the messengers of gospel grace turned to the Gentiles. Our "Student" will have to look somewhere else for unconditional personal election and reprobation.

Divinity of Christ, Denial of. What should be done with a member of the church who denies the divinity of Christ? He is what is usually called a consistent member and a good man. His doubt and denial have been caused by dabbling in scientific (?) unbelief. SIGNIA.

If it is a settled rejection of the Son of God as Lord and Saviour, he ought to sever his connection with the church: and if he does not do so, the church should dismiss him. See 2 John 9-11. But if it is merely a doubtful state of mind into which he has been led by his readings, there should be all patience and diligence in efforts to recover him out of his honest doubts. Mere

weakness of faith, or the doubts that accompany the transition from unthinking trust to an intelligent personal faith, do not furnish sufficient reason for exclusion from the church, but rather call for special fostering care until the peril is passed.

Doctrine and Duty in Old Testament. Is there anything pertaining to doctrine or duty in the Old Testament that is binding on us, and what and where?

Yes. See Rom. 15:4; 2 Tim. 3:15-17. This was spoken of the Old Testament Scriptures. See, also, 2 Pet. 1:19-21; Luke 24:27, 44-47. Nothing that is God-inspired can be unworthy of our attention. We go to the Old Testament—

(1) For historical information touching the creation of man, the introduction of sin, its fatal consequences, and the means divinely ordained to arrest it and prepare the way for the salvation which Christ brought.

(2) For the types and prophecies which foreshadowed Christ and his work.

(3) For true revelations of human character, in its various phases, and especially for examples of faith and patience such as Paul mentions (Hebrews 11). These examples are as forcible and valuable now as ever they were.

(4) For lessons in piety and righteousness which belong to no dispensation particularly or exclusively, but are as abiding as moral principles. Hence the New Testament refers to Elijah, Job, Abraham, Lot, Enoch, etc.

In point of *authority*, Jesus is our only lawgiver, and only that is binding which he has made binding in his own teaching or that of his embassadors. Sometimes this is quoted from the Old Testament and approved. But in point of illustration, example and evidence, to encourage

us to duty, to warn us of danger, to stimulate us to faithfulness, and to strengthen our faith, the Old Testament abounds in material. For instance, I take up the history of God's ancient people, and trace out the rewards of their obedience and the punishments of their disobedience. It may be that the same laws are not now authoritative; but the *principle* is still the same—that faith and obedience bring God's blessing, and that unbelief and disobedience bring his curse; and as illustrations of this, the Old Testament revelations are of great value.

No man can fully understand the New Testament without understanding the Old; for the New grows out of the Old. The New Testament for *authority,* the Old for *instruction,* to teach us to confide in that authority and to encourage us in obeying it—that is, perhaps, as clear a distinction as your queries ask for. But always study and apply the Old in the light of the New.

Doctrine, Form of. What is the form of doctrine spoken of in Rom. 6:17, which the brethren at Rome had obeyed, and were made free from sin? Do we not have to go to the commission which Christ gave to his apostles, in order to find the form of doctrine delivered? J. L. GRAHAM.

DUNCAN, Ky.

The gospel itself is compared to a mold into which melted metals are cast. The teaching or doctrine is the doctrine of Christ—Christ dying for sin, Christ buried in the sepulchre, Christ risen from the dead. See 1 Cor. 15:1-4. They had obeyed *from the heart* this mold of teaching into which they were delivered. Subdued and melted by the love of God, they had died to sin, been buried with Christ in baptism, and had risen with him through faith, to walk in a new life. They had taken on a new shape—were conformed to a new model, and in this transforming process had been made free from sin. This is free-

dom from the *love* and *dominion* of sin of which Paul here speaks, and not merely its *guilt*.

Dogs—Who Were They? We have quite a controversy in our Sunday-school in regard to the probable meaning of our Saviour when he used the words, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs." Will you give us your version of it in your next STANDARD? R. B. C.

The meat offered for sacrifice was regarded as holy. No unclean person was permitted to eat of it (Lev. 22:6, 10, 14; see, also, Ex. 22:31). Dogs were unclean and vile animals in Jewish estimation, and, next to swine, objects of abhorrence and symbols of vileness. To give such meat to dogs expresses the intensest idea of profanation. This we presume to be the allusion in our Lord's language. As to its application, it is an admonition to be considerate and discriminating in the bestowal of anything precious or sacred—so as not to dishonor truth and goodness by offering them to such as are sure to abuse them. See Prov. 9:7, 8. As the previous verses are a warning against harsh judgments, this, on the other hand, may be taken as a warning against the other extreme—a failure to discriminate wisely. Without harsh judgment, the fact is forced on us many times that certain persons are so utterly dishonest, base and corrupt that any attempt to enrich them with the treasures of heavenly wisdom would be like casting pearls before swine, and involves a profanation of holy things like that of giving the meat of holy offerings to dogs.

Elder, How Made and Unmade. How can a congregation dispose of an elder, whose Christian life is unblamable, but a majority of the members are dissatisfied with his preaching and his officiating? X. X. X.

How did they appoint him? If appointed by the voice of the church, the same voice can unmake him. But it

ought to be on good grounds, and for solid reasons, and not from a mere whim. When an elder knows that his services are no longer acceptable to a majority of the church, it ought not to require much management to displace him. He should tender his resignation.

Elder of Good Report. The Scriptures teach that a bishop must have a good report of them that are without. In looking out one for the business, a suitable one is found; and nothing to the contrary being well known, he has a good report of them that are without. After serving as an overseer for some years, then up comes a bad report. The church then proceeds to seek for the truth. The bishop is then found to be clear of the report against him. The church does not believe he is guilty, but on account of the Scripture which reads that a bishop must have a good report of them that are without, it holds that he is, or should be, excluded from serving in that office. After examining the case, and the bishop is found to be innocent of said charge—or the church believe him to be innocent—is it contrary to Scripture for him to hold or have the oversight as before? Does the Scripture apply to all that are without, or to every individual person? If he is proven innocent of said charge, is he to be excluded from the office of bishop because the report went out? As said above, the church has examined the case, and do not believe him to be guilty. R.

CALHOUN, Ala.

1. A "good report" means not the report of every individual in the community, but the general reputation of a person in the community in which he lives; especially among those whose judgment in such matters is respected as likely to be honest and just.

2. If evil reports arise against an overseer of the church, and they are proved to be false *in the estimation of the community generally,* as well as in the estimation of the church, of course he still continues to have "a good report of them that are without." And it is then the duty of the church to stand by him, and protect him from the unjust assaults of evil-minded persons. But, even if the

church should decide him to be innocent, if the outside community believe him guilty, or if his reputation is left in such doubt that he is no longer confided in or respected by the community generally, he ought to leave the eldership. The reason is, that it is essential to the success of the church that its rulers be able to challenge the confidence and respect of good people. Before the community, they represent the church; and the church suffers in reputation, and her converting power in the world is impaired, just in proportion to the want of good reputation on the part of her representatives. No man has a right to ask that the church shall retain him in office *as a means of vindicating his reputation.* This the church does sufficiently when she examines his case, pronounces him not guilty, and continues him without censure in her membership. But to demand that the church shall suffer, and be shorn of her power for good by continuing him in office, merely that he may not suffer, is unreasonable. Any man possessed of a true Christian spirit will prefer to suffer wrong himself rather than have the wrong visited on the church on his account.

We have known many instances in which men whom we deemed personally worthy, incurred a loss of reputation by dabbling in politics, or in speculations, or through failure in business, and their prominence in official positions in the church seriously impaired the influence of the church for good. And we have also known cases in which church officers were generally unpopular for no special reason, owing perhaps to some idiosyncracy. While no one doubted their integrity, they failed to command respect. In all such cases, men who love the church more than they love themselves, will step aside from public positions, and refuse to let the church suffer on account of their misfortunes.

At the same time the church should carefully protect her members, and especially her rulers, against injustice, by refusing to listen to popular clamor when there is no sufficient evidence of wrong, and by maintaining their good standing in the church as worthy of Christian fellowship. But holding them in office, for the reasons already stated, is not wise, nor can it be justly demanded as a means of their vindication. If innocent, they will be vindicated in due time. Their strength is to sit still.

Elijah? Was John the Baptist. BRO. ERRETT:—A good old brother thinks that Elias, who appeared at the transfiguration, was John the Baptist, and not Elijah the prophet. He thinks so from Matt. 17:11-13. He wants our opinion through the STANDARD, and he also wants to know the object of, or lesson taught the world by, the transfiguration. A SUBSCRIBER.

Our Lord does not say that the Elijah who appeared on the mount was John the Baptist. But Matthew says that when he spoke of Elijah as having come already, they understood him to speak of John the Baptist, who came "in the spirit and power of Elijah." It is safe to understand the narrative as referring to Elijah, the ancient prophet, and to regard the application of his name to John the Baptist as growing out of the inquiry of the disciples. It is as if he said, "They are right about the Scripture promise of Elijah first coming; but that was fulfilled in John the Baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elijah." It is characteristic of our Lord's style to use the same word with different meanings—one suggested by the other—half concealing, half revealing the matter, and exciting the minds of his hearers to inquire and search out the meaning for themselves.

As to the import of the transfiguration, there are two views:

1. The time had come for his disciples to understand

more clearly the transfer of authority that was to be made to him as Lord of all. Moses, therefore, the lawgiver, and Elijah, the law-restorer—the representatives of the law and the prophets—appeared and laid down their honors at his feet, while the voice from the cloud acknowledged the transfer, saying, "This is my beloved Son, *hear ye him.* Hear the law and the prophets no longer; he is here of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write: henceforth hear him." As, however, they were told, in descending the mountain, to tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man should rise from the dead, it is evident that this transfer of authority was not to take effect until after the resurrection.

2. The previous conversation in Matthew 16 had had the effect to discourage the apostles exceedingly. Instead of a kingdom such as they were looking for, they learned that their Lord was to be crucified, and his disciples would be persecuted and killed. This was disheartening, especially to Peter, to whom the keys of the kingdom had been promised, and to James and John, whose ambitious mother had been filling them with lofty notions of place and power. Our Lord, therefore, took these apart, to give them a glimpse of glory—a miniature view of the final reward of the faithful. Moses, who had died and been buried, appeared as the representative of the dead raised up. Elijah, who never died, came as the representative of the living who shall be changed. Jesus appeared in the magnificence and glory of his heavenly state. The bright cloud of Jehovah's presence brooded over the scene of transfiguration. It was the kingdom of glory in miniature. They saw it, and never forgot it. In their darkest hours they remembered it and took courage. See 2 Pet. 1: 16-19. Perhaps John 1: 14 also refers to the transfiguration.

Expulsion of Members. I notice in the STANDARD of February 17, W. B. H. asks the question, "Is there any New Testament authority for expelling a member from the Christian Church for any offense whatever?"

Your answer to his former question, and your comments upon this one, seem to carry the idea that God had delegated to the church the power to determine what persons might, and what persons might not, be members of Christ's church. If that is your view of the matter, please give us the chapter and verse.

Whatever meaning Paul meant to convey in the direction given to the church at Corinth in the case of the incestuous person, it is evident he did not mean excommunication, for in the second Epistle he commends the brethren that a majority had inflicted the punishment he had recommended, and then exhorted them to forgive him.

Your quotation of 1 Tim. 6:5 is also inadequate to prove excommunication, for Timothy was not the church, but an individual.

Would it not be better, in instructing the brethren, to leave it right where Jesus Christ left it in Matthew 18; *i. e.*, have no conversation or association with wicked persons who have come into the church, but let the reapers gather the wheat from among the tares; for we are baptized into Jesus Christ, without the consent of the church? WM. NELSON.

TRUMBULL, O., March 4.

1. That Paul did mean excommunication is evident from 1 Cor. 5:13: "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Language can not be plainer than this. The whole chapter is a reproof of their laxness in this case—the indifference to the purity and spiritual welfare of the church that allowed of no measures to be adopted that "he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among them." See vs. 2-7. He finally charged them to "put away" that wicked person from among them.

We do not perceive the force of the reason assigned against excommunication. The church evidently had carried out Paul's instructions—that is, the greater part had

done so; for in a church abounding in factions, and with anti-Pauline factions in it, it is too much to be expected that the entire church would obey his instructions. But the "greater number" did inflict the punishment, and no doubt avoided the person also, and refused to eat with him; and he had been brought to repentance, so that Paul now desires them to forgive him—which is equivalent to restoring him to the fellowship of the church.

2. Timothy was an individual, but he was there to set things in order, and to teach the church and its officers how to deport themselves. This withdrawal from such characters was not therefore on his individual account. He could not withdraw *himself,* and leave these false teachers to make a prey of the church. His withdrawal was the withdrawal of the church from them. It is well to say, however, what we had not noticed when we last wrote, that these words, "from such withdraw thyself," are wanting in all the oldest MSS., and can not be relied on as part of the text. We do not, therefore, rely on this. But we have a similar direction given to the Thessalonian church (2 Thess. 3:6). Paul *commands* them to "withdraw themselves from every brother that walks disorderly."

Again: The church at Pergamos (Rev. 2:14) is rebuked because it retained Balaamites and Nicolaitans. Mark: not because they *followed* them—for that they did not—but because they *had them in their membership.* The church is called on to repent. How could they repent, except by casting them out?

Our querist has failed, we think, to get the full idea of Matthew 18. The Jews had no *religious* association with heathens. To treat any man as a heathen was therefore not to have no "conversation or association" with him—that would be to treat him as a publican; but to

treat him as a heathen was to have no *religious* association with him.

The reapers will gather the wheat from among the tares; but don't forget that "the field is *the world*"—not the church—in which this separation is made. That there is to be a final separation, such as the church can not make, is evident; but that does not interfere with the church's duty to put away wicked persons.

The church has no more delegated power to reject than to receive members. In both cases we must be governed by the law of the Lord. That law instructs her to baptize believers, and to put away wicked persons.

That excommunication should be only a last resort, we admit. That there is such a thing as putting offenders under ban without excluding them, is evident from Rom. 16: 17; and that this would be better, in many cases, than exclusion, we are quite sure. But where all restorative measures have been exhausted, and the offender is still defiant, and his continuance in the church serves only, like a corrupt member of the human body, to spread corruption to others, it is best to cut it off and cast it from us—to purge out the old leaven. There are extremes on this question. Such inquiries as the above will tend to guard us from one extreme; but we must be careful they do not lead us into another.

Faith and Belief. Are the terms *faith* and *belief* synonymous? Would it be proper to substitute "belief" for "faith" in Rom. 5: 1?

At the close of Matthew's Gospel it says, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Was this promise made *solely* to the apostles? If so, and I believe that was Bro. Campbell's view, after the end of the Jewish state they had no promise of his presence, and Christians can not claim this passage as a promise of the Saviour's presence, of course. H.

MANCHESTER, O.

It is the same Greek term (*pistis*) which is translated *faith* and *belief*. There is no more difference in meaning in any two passages where that Greek term occurs than there would be if it were in all cases rendered by one English word. It would do just as well to say "justified by belief," in Rom. 5: 1, as it does to say "By him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 12: 39).

Faith and Repentance, Priority of. We are told by those who oppose the doctrines taught by the Christian Church in regard to "faith and repentance," that in every case where "faith and repentance are mentioned together in the Bible, repentance invariably comes first." Now, Bro. Errett, if you will sum up some of the arguments against this position, you will greatly oblige a SEEKER AFTER TRUTH.

There is an apparent force in this statement; but it is greatly impaired when another statement is added; namely, that in these cases *faith in God already* existed, and was a basis for the call to repentance. The Jews, who believed in God, were called on to "repent and believe the gospel"—that is, the good news that "the kingdom of heaven was at hand." And they were complained of, that they did not "repent, that they might believe" this good news—their love and practice of sin keeping them from appreciating or investigating the good news concerning the approaching kingdom. John, in preaching the coming kingdom, called men to repentance, but the call was based on their faith in God.

Paul preached "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Faith in God preceded both these, not only among Jews, but also among that class of Gentiles whom the gospel first reached—like Cornelius and Lydia. But when Paul preached to such

Gentiles as the jailer at Philippi, his first direction was, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." There can be no repentance *toward* God where there is not already some faith in God. But a believer in God may repent toward him, and, as a result, come to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Again, an unbelieving Gentile, like the jailer, may first believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and, as a result, be brought to repent toward God.

Faith, Is It Voluntary? Please explain 2 Thess. 2: 11, 12. Is it true as is said, "That a man can bring himself to believe anything he is inclined to believe"? If so, please show how it is.

1. The extent to which a man may pervert his intellectual and moral forces is fearful to contemplate. We know very well that the physical organs can be abused and perverted until they can never again be restored to their normal condition. It is equally true, though not so readily perceivable, in the faculties of the spiritual nature. Every desire and every faculty is capable of perversion. Thus a man may abandon himself to anger, and cultivate it until it thoroughly masters him, and he can not escape from its tyranny. A man may indulge fancy until he is no longer capable of sober reasoning. He may cultivate a sense of the ludicrous until he deprives himself of the very possibility of a reverential or solemn demeanor. So may he trifle with truth and yield to the seductions of falsehood, and abandon himself to the advocacy and defense of what he knows to be false, until his conscience and his judgment alike are hopelessly perverted, and he becomes the victim of his own sophistries.

The text speaks of what is generally styled a *judicial blindness,* a divinely visited infatuation as a judgment on those who despised and rejected the truth. Whether this involves anything more than an abandonment of

these lovers of falsehood to the legitimate consequences of their own false ways, is doubtful. He "sent" them strong delusion, or, rather, "the working of delusion," that they might reap the full harvest of the seed which they had chosen to sow. The reason is given: "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

Faith Produces Life. How shall we best treat such passages of the New Testament as John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," and 1 John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God," and at the same time give full force to repentance, baptism, continuance in well-doing, etc.? H.

1. Show that nothing is said of *repentance* in these passages, and that if the fact of baptism not being always mentioned proves that it has nothing to do with the matter, the same is true of repentance.

2. If it is answered that repentance is clearly *implied,* then show that, by his admission, it is conceded that "believeth" is not used in such texts in a limited sense, but as a leading term covering all that belongs to faith—its confession, the repentance that is really a part of it, and the baptism which is its proper proof and manifestation.

3. If it is still argued that a pint will not hold a quart, then show that a quart can hold a pint. The *quart* text, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is big enough to hold all the *pint* texts, "He that believeth," etc.

Faith as the *substance*—the foundation, the animating principle—is properly given a leading place, but must never be severed from obedience, as if it were faith *alone.* Faith stands in opposition to the works of the law, but not in opposition to the obedience of faith.

The phrase, "He that believeth is begotten of God,"

does not tell *how* we are begotten, but is given as one of the marks by which a child of God shall be known.

Faith, The. In Acts 15:9 Peter says, "And put no difference between them and us, purifying their souls by faith."

Will the original warrant us to say "By *the faith*," meaning *the gospel?* DISCIPLE.

The original warrants the translation, "the faith." Whether this can be interpreted as meaning the gospel, thus early designating it as a system of faith in opposition to a law of works, may be doubted. We think it can. See Acts 6:7. There are many texts in which the article is employed in the Greek, but suppressed in the common version—sometimes correctly, sometimes not. Take, for example, Rom. 5:2; 10:8, 17; 2 Cor. 1:24; Gal. 3:14, 23, 25, 26; 6:10; Eph. 2:8; 3:17; 1 Tim. 1:19; 4:6; 6:12. Rotherham says: "It can not be too strongly affirmed that the Greek article is never present without possessing its legitimate force. It is never superfluous. It can not always be translated; but the translator is bound in all cases to take it into account. No known idiom forbidding it should be translated." See chap. 2 of his Introduction, on the Greek article, in his translation of the New Testament.

Faith, The, Essential to Salvation. Inasmuch as you are a representative man among the Disciples of Christ, I desire to ask you, through the Querists' Department, if you, or the church of Christ as an organization, believe that a man may be saved if he believes all the New Testament and the larger portion of the Old? Suppose I accept the grand truths concerning Christ and his work, *but do not believe the historical account of Jonah and the whale, or of Daniel in the lions' den?* Can such a person be a Christian?

You could be saved through faith in and obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, if you had never heard about Jonah and the whale, or Daniel in the lions' den. Thou-

sands of Gentiles were brought into the church of whom it is safe to affirm that they had no knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures. Such knowledge came afterwards. Any one who accepts the Christ, and at his feet learns about the Old Testament, will have no difficulty to encounter. But how can you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, who says that "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," and then presume to deny the fact which he has so plainly affirmed? This is ridiculous. You do not accept Christ when you thus deny his teaching. If you were to come, avowing your faith in the Lord Jesus, and at the same time honestly saying that there were things in the Old Testament which puzzled you, you would be accepted on credible evidence of your faith and repentance; and you would be told that babes in Christ were not expected to be masters in all the mysteries of the Old Testament, but that in following Jesus as your teacher you would in due time come to understand much that now seems mysterious. But if you were to come bargaining to be admitted to the church on the express condition that you were at liberty to reject the Old Testament, your acceptance would be postponed until your difficulties could be removed.

Falling Away. With hesitation I venture to ask you to give me a complete exegesis on the thought conveyed in Heb. 6: 4-6. Is it possible, should I, or any one, "fall away," to renew our fellowship with God? G.

Evidently, the writer is speaking with special reference to the Hebrews to whom he writes, who had tasted the word of God, and "the powers of the age to come"—the Christian age—and had been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, but who were in danger of being drawn

away from Christ, back to Judaism. To go back to Judaism would be to declare Jesus an impostor, to count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and to do despite to the Spirit of grace by denying his miracles, and belying their own experience of all the converting, sanctifying and miraculous powers which the Spirit had conferred on them. The "falling away" of chap. 6, and the "sinning wilfully" of chap. 10, clearly relate to apostasy, and in apostatizing they would be cut off from all hope of salvation; for (1) in renouncing Christ there would be left no sacrifice for sin; and (2) the renouncing of Christ, after all their knowledge and experience, would be such a sin against light and knowledge, and would so violently wrench their moral nature as to destroy its integrity, and incapacitate it forever after for honest dealing with truth, and render it impossible to repent. The impossibility is an impossibility to renew them to repentance, just as a perversion of the powers of vision may be carried so far that it is impossible to renew the eye to correct vision.

While the language refers directly to the Hebrew Christians and their danger of apostasy, it is possible that a similar result may come in any case from a deliberate rejection of Christ. See 2 Thess. 2:9-12. It is possible to trifle with truth, and reject it, until it no longer has power over us. The truth loses not its power, but the perverted mind loses its power to apprehend it, and the perverted heart is no longer capable of feeling its force. If we "fall away" in the sense of that phrase in Hebrews, it will be found impossible to renew us to repentance—*because truth and grace will have exhausted their power on us;* there is left no better Saviour, no clearer truth, no richer grace, than that which we have deliberately renounced.

Family, Providing for. Like many others, I am poor, and my small family sometimes has to be very economical and sometimes suffer inconvenience. I am also in debt a few hundred dollars, partly contracted before I was married. I believe I do the best I can these hard times to earn a living, but when I say much about taking a couple of evenings for weekly prayer-meetings and sometimes time to prepare for the Sunday-school, and about putting five or ten cents in the contribution-box, and especially putting my name for a dollar or two for some special Sunday-school or church matter, my wife (a good Christian) reproves me, saying, "If any provide not for his own, etc., he is worse than an infidel" (1 Tim. 5:8). And now, having been chided with this verse, perhaps a hundred times within two years, I am really anxious to receive some suggestions from you. Perhaps an answer in your "Querists' Drawer" may help clear the minds of others who may be perplexed. Also, have I a right to use a cent for the support of the church while I owe any man, as we are commanded to owe no man? (Rom. 13:8.)

A. H. F.

It depends on circumstances of which, in each case, one must judge for himself. If you are in debt in such a way that your debt must be paid within a given time, and your income will barely enable you to meet it when it comes due, then clearly you ought to save every cent for the purpose of meeting the demands of honesty and justice. This is an essential part of our religion—to provide *honest* things in the sight of all men. But if your debts are of that character that they do not push you, and you have a reasonable prospect of meeting them when payment is due without having to hoard every dollar for that purpose, then you may righteously appropriate what you can spare from your income for benevolent purposes. And if your income is barely sufficient to provide for your family, of course this must first be attended to; but if, by self-denial, without inflicting injury on your family—and in this your Christian wife ought to be willing to join—you can give something to

help on the work of the Lord, it is your duty to do it, and you will be blessed in the deed. Jesus, for our sakes, became poor; we must not shrink from giving, even in "deep poverty" (2 Cor. 8:2), for his sake.

We must not forget that among our debts is the debt we owe to Jesus Christ and his cause. This ought to be as sacredly provided for as any other debt. True, "if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not." But if there be first a willing mind, we will try to manage so that neither our debts nor our families shall hinder us from doing something directly for the Lord. It is, indeed, all for the Lord. If we pay our debts, it is for the Lord. If we provide for our families, it is for the Lord. And if we can do no more than this, we are in this serving the Lord. But self-denial will generally enable us to do more. Pay your debts; provide for your family what is needful; but never rest content until you can do something also for the church. Study the case of the woman who gave the two mites, and learn its lesson.

Family Worship. Is it not the duty of every Christian man to have *family worship?* Can a household where the voice of prayer and the reading of the Scriptures is never heard, attain to that spiritual growth, and exert that influence for Christianity, which it ought to do?

There is no law requiring Christians to have family worship. Nor should any be required. The broad instruction to parents is, "Bring up your children in the instruction and discipline of the Lord." This requires the whole culture of home to be in the line of Christianity—the management of temper, of speech, of look and of conduct, must be in a Christian spirit, and with Christian ends and aims in view. For our part, we know not

how this is to be done, especially when children are young and impressible, and daily breathing in the influences that are to form their characters, without examples of prayer and praise, and daily instruction out of God's word. While we believe that formal and tedious worship in a family not otherwise regulated by Christian principles, may prove more of a curse than a blessing, we are quite sure that in a home where the Spirit of Christ reigns, worship can be made alike delightful and profitable. It is the steady accretions of knowledge and of religious sentiment, day by day, that form the character of the child, and secure it against the subsequent seductions of carnality and unbelief. But worship, like every other good thing, may be perverted and become an evil rather than a good. Stiff, cold, monotonous readings and prayers become wearisome and offensive. Short recitations, lively hymns, brief thanksgivings, readings in which all participate, and questions adapted to the capacities of the children—these are very desirable, and call for no little forethought and skill. When families feel their incompetency, would it not be well to make the Sunday-school lesson the theme of conversation and study through the week, with the aid of such expositions as our Bible lessons contain? Read part of the lesson at a time, or the whole of it at one sitting. Then, at another sitting, gather up the references. Then, get on a search for other parallel Scriptures. Then take up the notes on the lesson, and explain to the children the difficult portions of the lesson. Then have them recite the lesson. Let them select their own Sunday-school hymns and tunes. In this way the week could be occupied in a preparation that would send the children to school fully prepared on the lesson, and the parents ready to instruct classes.

Fasting. On the subject of fasting, I am not clear, although I read of it and have heard it preached of. Now, will you give me Scripture light? Is it a command? If so, for what shall we fast and at what time? J. N. JONES.
MEMPHIS, Tenn.

That fasting is *permissible,* see Matt. 5:16-18. It stands along with prayer and alms-giving, as entering into the life of a disciple of Jesus, but not to be ostentatiously observed.

It is not fitting on all occasions. It belongs to seasons of humiliation, trial and anxiety, when the soul requires special aid, and needs for that aid special preparation (Matt. 9:14; Acts 13:2, 3; 1 Cor. 7:5).

We do not now refer to the Old Testament, which abounds in examples of fasting, because, in point of authority, the New Testament should settle this question for Christians.

So far as private fasting is concerned, there is no time fixed nor manner prescribed. We must therefore be governed by a sense of our own wants. When we are in the presence of a great calamity, or weighed down with heavy trials, or in great perplexity as to our duty in any particular, or need girding up for a difficult work, it is well to join fasting with prayer in seeking divine support and guidance.

Fellowship, Apostolic. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship," etc. Our elder insists that fellowship means contribution, and says it is a part of the worship, and will not receive money only through the contribution, for any church debt. Most of the members would rather, when there is a debt to be paid, raise it privately among themselves, and consequently do away with having the plates passed around every Lord's Day. ENQUIRER.

Joint contributions of money are sometimes spoken

of as fellowship. See Rom. 15:26, where *contribution* is a translation of the Greek term. See, also, 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:13, where *distribution* is another translation of the same term. But the term is by no means exclusively appropriated to the matter of joint giving. It is used with reference to the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 10:16), and to that fellowship of faith, of duty and of interest that belongs to the household of God (Phil. 1:5; 2:1; 3:10; 1 John 3:1, 6, 7). It is altogether arbitrary to appropriate this exclusively or peculiarly to money contributions. Money was raised in different ways in the primitive churches. Originally, every man sold all he had and laid it at the apostles' feet. At Antioch, by a mutual voluntary agreement (Acts 11:29, 30). Through Macedonia and Achaia, by personal solicitation (2 Cor. 8:9). We are not tied up to any particular method by divine authority. It may, as a rule, be found desirable to have money paid in in weekly installments; but even then it needs to be agreed on how much shall be paid weekly by each member if we would have any certainty as to what we are to do.

As to *worship,* if it is done for the love of Christ, no difference when it is given. Our whole life of obedience is a sacrifice to God (Rom. 12:1; Heb. 13:16). If I do good in feeding a hungry man for Christ's sake, it is an act of worship, though it should be done in a bakery or in the market-place, on Monday or Friday. We must be careful how we bind our brethren where God has not bound them. It is well to agree on a method of raising money; and, generally, the weekly collection will be found a desirable method of paying it in. But this is not uniformly true. There are regions of country in which money only circulates freely at stated seasons, two or three times a year, and the whole business community

adjusts itself to the method of quarterly or half-yearly payments. Common sense, if it had fair play, would settle all such questions.

Fellowship, Hand of. 1. If we are *"baptized* into Christ," and are "all *one* in Christ," what relation do baptized persons sustain to the local congregation, who refuse to "receive the hand of fellowship" from the congregation?

2. In case one should apply to you for baptism, stating that "he did not wish to unite with your church," would you not encourage disunion, by complying with his request?

3. Are the officers and members of this congregation also officers and members of another congregation?

4. *Must* a baptized believer receive the hand of fellowship in order to membership in the "body of Christ," or does it require more to constitute him a member of a local congregation than of the church at large?

1. They are, by profession at least, members of the church of Christ, and, by virtue of their location, are amenable to the church in their locality.

2. We can impose no conditions, in administering baptism, but the Scriptural conditions of faith and repentance. If a candidate seeks to impose other conditions before he will consent to be baptized, of course we can not regard them. But if, in honesty and candor, he states, to guard against all misunderstanding, that he expects to take membership in some other religious body, it would lead to a postponement of the baptism until we learned the reasons for his proposed course; and whether we baptized him or not would depend on the result of our inquiries. We could not take the responsibility of refusing baptism to a sincere believer in Christ; but if we became convinced that sectarian bias governed him, rather than love of Christ, it would be a good reason to refuse to baptize him.

3. No. Elders are appointed by one church to serve

that church, and members of one church are responsible to that church for their conduct.

4. The right hand of fellowship is merely a courteous form of recognition, by which persons become publicly known as members of that particular church. It has no divine authority. The public mention of their names, without the hand of fellowship, would answer the same purpose, though, in the general judgment, it would not be so becoming. As a matter of order and propriety, it should be known, in some way, who are members of each church. *How* this should be known, is not divinely prescribed. It is therefore left to the discretion of Christians. Generally, the public sentiment approves their recognition by the right hand of fellowship. It takes no more to constitute them members of a local congregtion than of the church at large, except their locality; and the right hand of fellowship, or any equivalent of this, is simply a recognition of the fact that henceforth they are to be identified with that particular congregation. If persons are baptized, and do not in any way identify themselves with the church in their neighborhood, they should be visited, not to persuade them to become members of the church, but to persuade them to make themselves known as such. And if they fail to identify themselves with the church and its work, they should be dealt with as acting a disorderly part.

Feet-washing, Origin of. 1. At what time did feet-washing *first* begin to be practiced as a religious rite; by whom and under what circumstances? 2. Was the supper spoken of in John 13 the passover supper? A.

1. It is difficult to tell. In the time of Augustine it was evidently in use, for he mentions it in two of his epistles; but he says that many of the churches would not admit of the custom at all. The Roman Church

never received it; the church of Milan practiced it, the Spanish church rejected it, the Syrian church practiced it. The primitive practice of washing feet as a deed of hospitality, or as an act of humility, seems to have merged gradually in some quarters into a church rite, and was generally practiced by the bishop on the newly baptized. On Maundy Thursday Catholic monarchs and the pope symbolically practice it upon twelve poor old men. Bernard of Clairvaux desired to convert the Catholic ceremony into a sacrament, but without success. Speaking of the church of Milan, Bingham says: "Their reasons for practicing it were not so strong as to prevail with others, and so this custom never got any great footing in the Christian church."

2. We think not, but the question is in much doubt.

Feet-washing, Is It a Church Ordinance? Is feet-washing binding on us as a church ordinance?

No. The apostles were to teach the disciples to observe all things whatsoever the Lord had commanded. Among these "all things," feet-washing, as an ordinance to be observed by the church, has no place. The only place recognized for it is among "good works"—a rite of hospitality practiced by individuals. See 1 Tim. 5: 10. It is placed along with lodging strangers, relieving the afflicted, and other works of benevolence. It bears no marks of a church ordinance.

Festivals. Is it right for the brethren to conduct matters as a great many of them do on and about Christmas-times?

They here throw open the church doors—but not for worship. They meet with no other intention than a worldly one, in one sense at least, having an oyster supper or a festival of some sort very similar to one. What influence have these things on the young inquiring minds who had not made a start toward a Christian confession? Does it not remind us of the "money-changers, and those who sold doves"? OBSERVER.

There is nothing wrong in having a festival, if it is properly conducted. Paul allowed Christians to go to the feasts to which pagans invited them, thus recognizing the propriety of social gatherings and festivities—subject, of course, to the considerations of temperance and purity, which, with Christians, can never be dismissed.

Sunday-school festivals come nearer than any others now in vogue to our Lord's teaching—that when we make a feast, we should call in the poor, the maimed, the blind, etc.; those who really need it, and who can not recompense us. There are generally in Sunday-schools a good many poor children who can have no feasts at home; and if they are not in the school any other time, they are pretty sure to gather about Christmas-time. It is an era in their lives to get a good oyster supper. All meet on a common level at such times, and we have a great deal more sympathy with such feasts than with the select ones from which the poor are shut out. It is important to guard against excesses at such times, and to have the festive occasion marked by dignity and purity as well as by cheerfulness and social feeling.

Now as to having these feasts in the house of worship, there is nothing really wrong in it, yet it may not be advisable. The *associations* of a house of worship should all be favorable to solemnity and quiet, and on that account it may be desirable to have merely social gatherings at other places. Yet the early Christians had their love-feasts in their places of worship. The house of worship should never be too good for any good, Christlike work that needs to be done. But if a gathering of young folks is likely to be too merry to harmonize with the solemnity that belongs to a place of worship, better for the sake of fitness to have it somewhere else.

A house of worship, however, is not like the Jewish

temple. In the latter, the *place* was holy; to the Christian, holy times and places have largely lost their significance; that is, no one particular spot is holy ground, further than a sense of fitness and the laws of association make it desirable to set apart particular places for religious ends. Traffickers crowding into the holy temple for the sake of gain—dishonest gain at that, it would seem—can not properly be compared with benevolent people occupying a place of worship for the sake of cultivating kindly feeling and doing good to the children. If the writer speaks of *paid* festivals and schemes of raising money by appeals to appetite, there is more justice in the comparison, and we agree with him.

Flesh, Sowing to. In Gal. 6:8, "He that sows to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; he that sows to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Please tell in your good paper whose flesh and whose spirit that he reaps corruption and life everlasting.

One's own flesh and spirit. These are regarded as soils which we cultivate. We may cultivate our fleshly nature, and live to serve the flesh. If so, we reap a corresponding harvest. Or, we may cultivate the spirit, and live to promote spiritual ends. If so, we reap a corresponding harvest. In the one case, the harvest is corruption; in the other, it is life everlasting.

Foreordination. In Acts of the Apostles 13:48 it reads thus: "And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord. And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed."

Please give us your opinion on the latter clause of that verse.

A BROTHER.

This text has long been a battle-ground for Calvinists and Arminians. We have explained it so often that the task is getting monotonous. We submit, however, the

criticisms of two very candid and considerate commentators, who, on this text, may be taken to represent the most moderate school of Calvinistic interpretation.

"The Jews had judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life; the Gentiles, as many as were *disposed* to eternal life, believed. By whom so disposed is not here declared; nor need the word be in this place further particularized. We know that it is God who worketh in us the will to believe, and that the preparation of the heart is of him; but to find in this text preordination to life asserted, is to force both the word and the context to a meaning which they do not contain."—*Alford.*

"That the word here rendered *ordained* signifies not merely a disposition of mind in the actor, but a determination or decision affecting him by some one else, and here by God, is, I think, clear from the following considerations: (1) The form of the verb, which is the passive participle; they *were disposed by* some power or influence acting upon them; (2) from the verb itself—*tasso*—which signifies not a mere mental disposition or choice, but a determination or decree. For its use by Luke, see Luke 7:8; Acts 15:2; 22:10; 28:23; (3) from other parallel teachings of the N. T., which represent faith as the result of divine grace working in the heart of the believer. For Luke's recognition of this truth, see Luke 7:8; Acts 2:47; 5:14; 22:10. Comp. 1 Cor. 3:6; Phil. 2:13; Rom. 8:29, 30. But there is certainly nothing in this passage to indicate that the divine disposing of the Gentiles to believe was an eternal or an inevitable decree; nothing more is indicated than an effectual work of grace, accepted by the Gentiles and for that reason effectual."—*Abbott.*

Mr. Abbott's last remark is a surrender of the whole controversy. Granting that the form of the verb indi-

cates a disposing or determining by some power or influence acting upon them—had not Paul and Barnabas been bringing such influence or power to bear upon them? and had they not fully preached that gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes"? The fact is as clear as day in the narrative, that Paul and Barnabas disposed them to eternal life by preaching the gospel to them, and that as a result of their influence thus exerted upon them, they believed; and that the difference between the two parties was that one accepted the gospel and the other rejected it.

Forgiveness of Our Fellow-men. Are we required to forgive our fellow-men their trespasses, if they do not ask us to?

By answering this practical question and giving Scriptural proof, you will greatly oblige a number of truth-investigating brethren. L. E. BROWN.

MANNSVILLE, N. Y.

We do not like the form of this question—as if forgiveness were only to be dealt out under law, and we were at liberty to indulge an unforgiving spirit until the law exacts it of us. If our querist inquires concerning *formal* forgiveness—extending the assurance of forgiveness to those who sin against us—this is not required of us, nor can it be reasonably granted, until there is repentance and confession. "If thy brother turn to thee, and say, I repent, thou shalt forgive him" (Luke 17:3, 4). This certainly implies that until the sinner repents, he is not to be forgiven. We are taught to pray, "Forgive us our sins, as we forgive those who sin against us." But our heavenly Father does not promise to forgive us until we repent and confess and ask forgiveness.

But if reference is had in the question to a *merciful and forgiving spirit,* this does not depend on the repentance and confession of the transgressor. Though our

Father promises forgiveness only to those who repent, yet in love and pity he is ever seeking to bring sinners to repentance. And this must be our spirit. Our Lord prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies, which he could not have done had he not desired their forgiveness. The prayer shows that he had in his heart no unforgiving spirit, yet it was a prayer that did not disregard the proper conditions of forgiveness—a prayer that might be brought to repentance. In this spirit should we deal with those who sin against us: not hating them, or refusing to do them good, but in love seeking to lead them to repentance.

We can not afford to cherish an unforgiving spirit, for it damages our own souls. *We* are the worse for it: it drives us away from God in our own feelings and desires. But, while we are thus taught to cultivate a merciful and loving spirit towards our enemies—to love them that hate us, bless them that curse us, and pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us—we are not taught to extend forgiveness formally to transgressors until they repent and confess: nor would it be for the best interests of society to do so. There is something due to violated truth and justice, for the transgressor's own sake, and for the sake of society, and especially for the sake of the church. Our conclusion is that we should love those who sin against us, pray for them, do them all possible good, and thus seek to bring them to repentance, that they may be forgiven. But if they resist all this, and despise our kindness, then we should let them be unto us as heathens and publicans—that is, have nothing to do with them.

Forgiveness, When a Duty. At our annual meeting the question was asked and discussed: Is it our duty to forgive those that sin against us, if they do not ask to be forgiven? Bro.

Errett, I have been requested to send the above question for you to answer through the Harbinger. I also ask the following on the same subject:

1. Is it safe at all times to obey Jesus? "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; if he repent, forgive him, and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him" (Luke 17:3, 4).

2. Can there be forgiveness without remission of sin?

3. Can there be remission of sin without penitence?

4. If God should forgive all that sin against him without their repentance, would there not be a universal salvation?

NEW BALTIMORE, O. J. H. HARRIER.

It depends on what is meant by *forgiveness*. If it is meant that we are at liberty to cherish revengeful or uncharitable feelings towards those who sin against us, and to treat them with neglect or contempt until they repent and ask forgiveness, we say that the Scriptures teach nothing of this kind. God loved sinners when they were sinning against him, with that love of benevolence which sought to lead them to repentance that they might be saved, but not with that love of complacency which would admit them to fellowship with him without repentance. Jesus prayed for the forgiveness of his murderers while they were in the very act of murdering him. So did Stephen. Yet if Stephen's life had been spared, he would doubtless have continued to testify against them and rebuke them until they repented. These conclusions are evident from these and other Scripture teachings:

1. *We should always cherish and exercise a kind and forgiving spirit.* It is our duty to love even our enemies. Under no circumstances are we at liberty to cherish or to display unkindness or enmity. It is our duty to *pray* for those who sin against us. We can not do this if our hearts are filled with anger or unkindness.

2. *It is our duty to labor to bring those who sin*

against us to repentance. We have no right to stand off and pout and scold and nurse wrathful feelings. See Matt. 5:23, 24; 18:15-17. It is not until we have exhausted every effort, and they still remain impenitent, that we are at liberty to cast them off.

3. After all such efforts have been made in kindness and love, and they still remain impenitent, we are at liberty to withhold all religious fellowship, and, if their sin is of a character to warrant it, all social intercourse —that they may be ashamed. But in all this we are not at liberty to feel or act in any other spirit than that of kindness, and we should still pray for their forgiveness, and do them any good it is in our power to do. *We can not afford to act in any other spirit,* because of the injury it would do to our own souls. But they have no right to ask forgiveness, and we are under no obligation to grant it, until they repent. Only repentance can restore the spiritual relationship and unembarrassed friendship which existed before their sin was committed.

4. The language of our Lord in Luke 17 puts a strong, extreme case, for the sake of teaching that we should, under all circumstances, be ready to forgive a brother when he repents. It is not likely ever to occur that one man will sin against another seven times in a day; nevertheless, it is a *possible* thing, and the case is thus strongly put to teach that we are never to grow weary of exercising forgiveness. Whether the offender is sincere or not, we are not bound to judge; it is better to treat him as sincere, and throw the responsibility on him, than to sit in judgment on him and presume to decide on his motives.

It may seem very hard to exact of us such leniency towards transgressors; but if we remember how very merciful God has been to us, we may readily forgive the

hundred pence when God has forgiven the ten thousand talents (Matt. 18:23-35).

Touching Bro. Harrier's questions, forgiveness of sins and remission of sins are equivalent in the Scriptures. Whatever may be God's merciful spirit towards us, our own impenitence shuts us out from receiving or enjoying the forgiveness of sins. Even were we to suppose that God will forgive all sins unconditionally, *that* would not secure "universal salvation"—for salvation involves deliverance from the love, the dominion and the practice of sin; and while this is unaccomplished, there is no salvation. Our sins separate us from God: no difference what God's feelings toward us, our feelings toward him shut us out from all divine fellowship. We are not saying that there is no divine justice to bar the heavens against impenitent transgressors; but we do say that even were no such justice asserted, the sins of the impenitent separate between them and God, and their iniquities hide his face from them.

Funerals. What is your opinion in reference to funeral meetings, or funeral preaching—are they contrary to the gospel spirit? and from whence do they come? and where, when and by whom do they come? DANIEL PARKER.

FLORA, Carroll Co., Ind.

Funeral customs have varied with the variety of races and nations, and often have changed in the same nation at different periods. Funeral rites, however, of some sort, have been celebrated among all peoples, even among savages. They are older than history. We read of them in patriarchal times, as in the cases of Jacob and Joseph, and frequently during the Jewish dispensation. The Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, whether they burned, mummified or buried the bodies of the dead, had funeral rites; and these were arranged with reference to the

social, civil or religious standing of the deceased. In the New Testament, and especially under the Christian dispensation, we read of no special ceremonials in connection with burial, further than this, that in the case of Stephen devout men carried him to his burial, and made great lamentation over him (Acts 8:2), from which it would appear that they did not bury their dead without recognizing their worth, and giving suitable expression to their sorrow.

Whether there shall be a sermon preached on a funeral occasion, accompanied with singing and prayer, must be decided on general principles, for we have no special instructions on that point, and very little light is shed on it by examples. For that reason, there should be no attempt to enforce any particular custom as authoritative. Nevertheless, we should be careful to guard against extremes. Pompous funeral display is contrary to the spirit of Christianity. Extravagant outlays over the dead are not only needless, but unjustifiable, in view of the need of our means for the benefit of the living. As a rule, funeral sermons make little impression, and, since they are apt to be perverted into eulogies of those who are unworthy, had better be abandoned. In more than forty years' experience, we remember *one* instance —only one—in which a funeral sermon waked a community to listen to the gospel, and resulted in the conversion of some threescore souls. Generally, the minds of hearers are distracted by the spectacular exhibitions at the funeral, and it is not expected that the mourners will be found in a frame of mind favorable to the hearing of a sermon. Generally, the reading of a few passages of Scripture, and a few remarks bearing on the great questions of life and death, for the benefit of the living, and directing sorrowing hearts to the Saviour,

will be found better than a funeral sermon. Whether there shall be singing or not, must be determined by the circumstances.

It is now growing into a custom in the cities to have burials private, after the brief funeral services are over. This avoids much needless expense, and saves the poor from the oppressions and exactions of the former custom.

God, Justice and Mercy of. As teacher of the Bible class in our Sunday-school here, I am not unfrequently confronted with questions from the class which I find myself unable to answer satisfactorily, even to myself; and that, too, after the most diligent consultation of all the "helps" at my command.

As a specimen of the interrogatories sometimes propounded, and which occasionally trouble me not a little: I was this morning asked by an intelligent gentleman of skeptical proclivities, to reconcile the cruelty, the bloodshed, the death and carnage which characterized Joshua's relentless war of extermination against the Canaanites, with the spirit of love, justice, mercy and universal peace and good will which is breathed in almost every chapter of the divine volume, and which are the essential attributes of that God who was himself, *in propria persona,* the commander-in-chief of the Israelitish army. I believe this question to be deserving of more than a brief paragraph.

GOLCONDA, Ill., Feb. 21. C. J. KIMBALL.

1. We suppose the objectors see nothing contrary to the goodness and mercy of God in the destruction of multitudes by earthquakes, famines, pestilences, etc., and had these Canaanites been thus destroyed, we should never have heard of this objection. But their destruction by such means would have defeated God's purpose. He was seeking to overthrow idolatry, and to lead the nations to a knowledge of the one living God. Had he destroyed them by a natural convulsion or a pestilence, idolators would have said their own gods did it, and it would have sunken them deeper in idolatry. But when they were destroyed by the chosen champions of Jehovah's cause,

and in direct defiance of their gods, then it became evident that their gods were as nothing in the presence of Jehovah's power.

2. What we call cruelty in this case, is so called only in a narrow view of the question. In a larger view, what seems to be cruelty to the individual or the tribe, is mercy to the race. These tribes were wholly given to wickedness and all sorts of pollutions and abominations. They were incorrigible in their sins and crimes. Their continued existence could only be a source of pollution and moral ruin to their children and to all who might come under their influence. Especially would it be such to God's chosen people. It was therefore a benefit to the race in all ages that they should be exterminated, since they could not be reformed. As to cruelty, let it be remembered that it came on those who deserved it, and who, if they had been spared, would have visited greater cruelties on the innocent. See Judg. 1:6, 7. Is there any mercy in sparing such wretches to carry on their outrages? Just as much as in sparing a murderer, and letting him loose to murder other innocent ones. It is a diseased sensibility that spends itself on the fate of the reckless criminal, forgetful of the welfare of society at large. It is in this large view the Psalmist celebrates God's judgments as great mercies. See Ps. 136: 14-24.

3. We must always keep in mind the difference between the rules of personal conduct and of those who act in an official capacity for society. The laws of kindness, love, forgiveness and forbearance, given to regulate the individual life, are designed to spread from life to life until society at large comes under their power. Meanwhile, to protect society against such as will not thus live, laws are made with penalties attached. To punish wrongdoers according to law, is not cruelty; it is simple justice

to society. In the parts of Scripture referred to by our querist God is acting as Governor of the nations, and employing the Jews to execute his will, just as a sheriff is employed to execute the sentence of the law on the murderer.

Had God authorized the visitation of such punishment on the good, there would be some force in the objection; but his judgments were poured out on the wicked, the cruel, the incorrigible. If it be objected that their innocent offspring were involved in the punishment, we reply that this was not for the sake of being cruel, but arose from the structure of society. It is one of the evils incident to society, that the innocent suffer with the guilty, just as all the members of the body suffer for the wrong done by one member. This is not peculiar to the Bible; it is part of the constitution of nature.

Gospel, Forerunner of Civil Liberty.

In a very thoughtful paper on "Phases of American Infidelity," read by Dr. W. F. Warren, of the University of Boston, before the late Evangelical Alliance in New York, the great revival of the last century was presented in a new point of view. The learned Doctor first gave a very connected, though not exaggerated, account of the internal condition of the English colonies when Whitefield commenced his great work, in these words:

"Going back, then, to the Colonial period of our country's history, we are struck at the outset by the remarkable fact that the first effective preparation of the original British-American colonists for social and political unity was due to a great religious awakening, the revival which commenced in 1740. Down to that time the spirit of intercolonial jealousy, isolation and repellancy had prevailed over every centripetal and nationalizing influ-

ence. Till that time there had been neither ethnological, political, social nor religious unity. On the contrary, the numberless international, civil, social and religious antagonisms of all Europe seemed concentrated upon a narrow strip of this Atlantic coast. Shut in between the territories of France upon the north and west, and Spanish Florida on the south, bisected near the middle by large Dutch and Swedish populations in New York and Delaware, overdotted with settlements of every European nationality, the little British colonies of two hundred years ago presented in most respects the least hopeful aspect of all the European dependencies in the New World. No two existed under a common charter, scarce two had a like religion. Here a Romanist colony was nearest neighbor to settlements of fugitive Huguenots; there the plain and pietistic Quaker was separated only by a boundary-line from the formal and rite-loving Anglican. Noblemen and peasants, Papists and Protestants, Roundheads and Cavaliers, Royalists and haters of royalty, believers and unbelievers—all found themselves standing on a common platform, all faithful to their Old World affinities. Out of elements so utterly heterogeneous, whence could unity and order come? It could come only from that Author of peace and Giver of concord who delights to reconcile all antagonisms and unify all that sin has dissevered."

Accepting this as the state of affairs in 1740, the question arises, How was the sentiment and the fact of union brought out of this disorder? That both the sentiment and the fact existed a generation later, is well known to all thoughtful readers of our political history. In 1765 the colonists stood together with a good degree of unanimity in offering the Address to the King, the Memorial to the House of Lords and the Petition to the House of

Commons; in 1774 they stood together still more closely and firmly in adopting the Declaration of Rights; more closely still in putting forth the Declaration of Independence in 1776; and had so far overcome their State pride, selfishness and feeling—had become so national in mind and heart—that they framed and ratified the National Constitution in 1787-89. The historian well asks what were the fires in which the old dissocial and disunion ideas and sentiments were melted down preparatory to a social and political recasting of the American people? His answer has been, they were social, moral and political forces. We do not understand that Dr. Warren denies that this is in a great part true, but he also assigns a great part of the work to the labors of Whitefield, whose attention, of course, was directed to a different quarter:

"Toward the middle of the last century came the fullness of God's time for generating a new Christian nationality. First a soul was needed to organize the rich though motley elements into one living, national body. That soul was communicated, as by a divine afflatus, in the Whitefieldian revival. In its mighty heat the old intellectual and spiritual partition walls by which the colonies had been so long isolated fused, and let one tide of gracious influence roll through the whole domain. For the first time in their history, the British colonies were agitated by one thought, swayed by one mind, moved by one impulse. Again and again through all these colonies this most famous evangelist of history moved in triumph. Puritan New England forgot that he was a gowned priest of the very church from whose oppression they had fled to the wilds of a new world. Dutch New York and German Pennsylvania almost unlearned their degenerating vernacular, as they listened to

his celestial eloquence. The Quaker was delighted with his gospel simplicity; the Covenanter and Huguenot with his "doctrines of grace." The Episcopalians were his by rightful church fellowship; and thus, when it came to pass that, after crossing the ocean eighteen times in his flying ministry, he lay down to death in Newburyport, he was unconsciously, but in reality, the spiritual father of a great Christian nation. The fact has never been duly acknowledged by the historian, but a fact it is."

This fact, if fact it be, has not indeed been recognized by the historian. No one, so far as we are aware, has even noticed it. In a private letter, in answer to a note of inquiry, Dr. Warren says he has never read the thought in any writer. He says it was forced upon him "by a study of the facts of the transitional period elapsing between the time of the original Colonial life of the nation, and the unification of the colonies in the struggle of the Revolution." Perhaps we are not yet ready to accept his view in the broad range in which Dr. Warren presents it. To be sure, religion is a divider or a uniter of peoples and states, as history shows in repeated instances; and undoubtedly Providence had a great part in our early history. The present question is one of great interest, both to the man of religion and to the philosophical statesman, and it deserves fuller study. What if it shall turn out that George Whitefield, whose only care was to win souls, in winning them was unconsciously working mightily in preparing the way for the American Union?

E. A. H.

Hands, Laying On. Please explain in querists' column Acts 14:23, in regard to ordination of elders, who should *fast,* and what about laying on of hands? The "Bible plan" for choosing church officers is what we want.

The meaning of the term rendered *ordained* in Acts

14:23 is "chosen by show of hands." It is the same word used in 2 Cor. 8:19. But whether it was the stretching forth of the hands of Paul and Barnabas, to be laid on the heads of those who were thus designated as elders, or the stretching forth of the hands of the people to express their choice of elders, or their approval of the persons designated by the apostles, we can not certainly determine. The Revised Testament renders this verse: "And when they [Paul and Barnabas] had appointed for them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." This makes the appointing, praying and fasting all to be done by the apostles. The following conclusions appear to us to be safe, in view of all the New Testament teaches:

1. Paul and Barnabas, in case of infant churches that themselves had planted, would necessarily suggest the selection of proper persons for bishops, and would see to it that no improper persons were selected; even as Timothy and Titus were instructed to do in churches that needed to be set in order.

2. We would reason *a priori* that no such selection would be made by them without due regard to the judgment and wishes of the membership; because these two men were wise, and wisdom would dictate this course. And this is confirmed by the fact that, even in the case of table-deacons, the apostles directed the people to choose out from among themselves a certain description of persons whom they (the apostles) might *appoint* over this business (Acts 6:3-6). The people were consulted; and in the more important work of elders, it is reasonable to conclude that they were also consulted, and that they chose out such men from among themselves as Paul and Barnabas had described.

3. If, in this way, the church participated in the work which the text speaks of as if it had been done by Paul and Barnabas alone, we may reasonably conclude that in the fasting and prayer the people also joined.

We may as well remark here that, according to the best evidence as to the practice of the churches in the earliest ages, the concurrence of the people was required in all such ejections.

Guard against open nominations. They are fruitful in mischief, and are sure to lead to the choice oftentimes of incompetent and even unworthy persons. Let wise men recommend suitable persons to the church for their approval. In infant churches such as those spoken of in Acts 14, and weak churches such as those to which Timothy and Titus were sent, let the evangelist instruct the people as to the kind of men wanted, and, after due consultation with the brethren, suggest persons to the church for its approval; and unless the approval of the church rests on men of whose fitness and worthiness he is satisfied, let him refuse to ordain them. The sad blunders all over the land in the selection of elders should lead to extreme carefulness in choice and in ordination.

Happiness, Degrees of. Do the Scriptures teach degrees of happiness in heaven?

"In his presence is fulness of joy." But what is fullness of joy to one, may not be to another. He who rules over ten cities may be no more complete in joy than he who rules over five. But that there are varieties of capacity and varieties of attainments, and consequently varieties of reward, is, we think, clear from many intimations in the Scriptures, and must be so in the nature of things. No man can have real happiness only in that which is *his own;* the elements of it must be found *in his*

own nature, and not in mere surroundings. If we are to reap as we have sown, then they who sow sparingly shall reap sparingly, and they who sow bountifully shall reap bountifully. It is important to reflect that the heaven we are to enjoy is not merely or mainly an external condition, but *the legitimate fruit of our lives here.*

Healing by Anointing. I wrote you some two weeks ago, asking you a question and explanation of Jas. 5:14, 15. I was much disappointed in not being answered through the STANDARD. Now, Bro. Errett, this is the second time that I have asked questions of you, and you have not answered either of them. I wish that you would answer this last question. I find that some of our brethren are holding that we have the same power to heal now that the apostles had.

It would not be surprising, dear Bro. Taylor, if you had asked a dozen questions, and never got an answer. We can not find space to answer one in ten of the queries that come here, and this of yours has been so often asked and answered, that questions of a fresher character have the preference. What would you say if you had to wait six months, as many do, in place of two weeks? This is not because of any desire to treat any with neglect, but from the utter impossibility of finding space to answer a tithe of the queries we receive. But since your case is urgent, we will neglect others for your sake just now.

If any of your brethren have a notion they can succeed in keeping everybody alive by anointing them with oil, etc., *let them try it.* The result will soon show their mistake. That the language of James is not of universal application, is evident (1) from the fact that, if so, Christians might live on forever by repeated anointings, and this we know was not true in the apostolic age, and has never been true; (2) there would have been no need for Paul to leave Trophimus at Miletum sick (2 Tim. 4:20),

nor yet that he should have had sorrow and alarm over Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25-28), when anointing and prayer would have delivered him at once from danger. If not of universal application, we must seek proper limitations. From 1 Cor. 12:9, 30, we learn that healing was one of the spiritual gifts, classed along with other miraculous gifts which Paul says (chap. 13:8) were to pass away. This limits it to the age of miracles. But even in that age it was not universal, as we have seen. We find that, in the apostolic age, persons were smitten with disease on account of their sins (1 Cor. 11:30-32). Verse 16 of James 5 connects this class of healings with sins committed. Upon confession of their sins, and repentance, the elders of the church were to anoint them with oil, and pray over them, and forgiveness and healing are both promised on these conditions. But if they did not repent and confess the sins for which they had been smitten, there was no healing; the sickness ended in death. For this "sin unto death" John says they were not to pray (1 John 5:16); but if the sin was confessed and forsaken, then, upon asking, life and health would be given.

Hearing from an Adventist. A neighbor of ours—a Seventh-day Adventist—says if I will show him, from the New Testament, either by the words or example of Christ or the apostles, that we should keep Sunday instead of Saturday, he would, with all sincerity, do so. Please show us all the proof, and oblige a SUBSCRIBER.

There is no proof that we are to keep Sunday *instead of Saturday*. We have nothing to do with keeping one day instead of another. Saturday commemorated creation and deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 20:11; Deut. 5:15). Neither of these events are commemorated by the first day of the week—but the resurrection of Jesus

Christ. The law is *dead* (Rom. 7: 1-6). We are now under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and if any one can show, from the time he received all authority (Matt. 28: 18), that either he or his apostles taught the observance of Saturday, all right; if not, we have nothing to do with it.

Heart in Religion. Do you believe in heartfelt religion?
E. L. J. PALMER.

We believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. We hold that in believing in him we must believe *with all the heart.* We teach that we must love the Lord our God *with all the heart;* that we must pray not merely in words, but *from the heart;* that in singing we must "make melody *in the heart* to the Lord;" and that the "end of the commandment" is love *out of a pure heart,* and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. Also, that when a man's heart is not right in the sight of God, no service of his can be acceptable. Will that do? But we do not think that groans and shouts and swoons and visions and trances and jerks and barkings are necessarily evidences of heartfelt religion.

Heathen, Destiny of. What do the Scriptures teach as to the destiny of the heathen, or those who never have the opportunity of hearing the gospel? Will such be any more accountable than those who can not understand the gospel—such as infants and idiots? What are we to understand by the "light of nature"?
W. H. ROWLETT.
HODGES, S. C.

1. That they will be judged according to their deeds, and according to the light they have (Rom. 2: 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 26). They are certainly more accountable than infants and idiots. These last can not understand *anything;* the heathen, although they do not understand the

gospel, understand a great deal about right and wrong, and are "a law unto themselves" (v. 14).

2. The "light of nature" is the light of reason, of conscience, of experience—such light as may be obtained in the absence of revelation. Much that is called the light of nature is unquestionably the light of tradition.

Holy Spirit, Baptism of. If I ever read anything directly on the thought I am about to mention, I have forgotten it. I get the thought from Acts 2:37, 38, inclusive.

If the baptism or gift of the Holy Spirit (either one or the other) was for the remission of sins, why did those believers on the day of Pentecost fail to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit until after obedience?

The apostles were full of the Holy Spirit, and preached what the Spirit dictated; and the *hearing, seeing* ("that which ye see and hear") *believers* are commanded to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus, in order to receive *the gift* of the Holy Spirit. Certainly the Holy Spirit did not fail to fulfill its mission.

Bro. Errett, I believe this is a subject worthy of your masterly pen.

Either the gift of the Holy Spirit was not for the remission of sins, or else it failed on the day of Pentecost to be so understood by the apostles or their hearers. Never was there a more convenient season or opportunity for the Holy Spirit to have entered the hearts of the hearers than on the above-mentioned time and circumstance.

The only reason I can give why the Holy Spirit did not enter into the hearts at once of the Pentecostians, is because it was not God's plan. ROBT. D. GARDNER.

We don't see that there is any good reason for confusion of mind on this question, except as we come with preconceived notions to the study of the Bible—not to learn what it teaches, but to ascertain what help we can get from it to favor our previously formed and cherished opinions. The following considerations should be carefully weighed:

1. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is nowhere de-

clared to be for the remission of sins. Read Joel 2:28-32, along with Acts 2:16-21. It was a *miraculous* impartation of the Spirit, whose presence and power were to be known by visions, dreams, prophesyings, speaking with tongues, etc. The "deliverance" or "salvation" spoken of was to be the result of the revelation thus made by the Spirit—the revealed gospel, which Peter preached on that day.

2. The Holy Spirit was not poured out on *sinners,* on the day of Pentecost, but on the *apostles* and *disciples.* When Peter, "filled with the Spirit," preached the gospel to unbelievers, the Spirit reached their hearts *through the preached gospel,* and not by a spiritual baptism. See Acts 2. In the only other instance of baptism in the Spirit, mentioned in the New Testament, there are the same miraculous results (Acts 10:44-46). The object of this baptism in this instance was not to bestow the remission of sins, but to demonstrate that the Gentiles, equally with the Jews, were entitled to the blessings of the gospel. See Acts 11:1-18.

3. There is a marked difference between the work of the Spirit in convicting men of sin—which is always accomplished through the word of God, or the gospel (Rom. 1:16; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23)—and the bestowal of the Spirit upon the purified heart; and both of these are different from the baptism in the Spirit. To put it in distinct form:

1. The baptism in the Spirit conferred upon the apostles the divine gifts of inspiration and power by which they were enabled to preach the gospel with infallible accuracy and confirm their preaching by signs and wonders and divers miracles; and also divinely attested the right of the Gentiles to enter, equally with the Jews, into the kingdom of God.

2. By means of this inspired preaching, the Spirit convicted sinners of sin, righteousness and judgment, and enlightened them as to the mercy of God and the conditions of salvation.

3. When sinners were thus turned to God and brought into the enjoyment of salvation, that Spirit which the world can not receive (John 14:17) is bestowed upon the new-born child of God, as the earnest or pledge of the heavenly inheritance. See Acts 4:38; Gal. 4:6; 2 Cor. 1:21, 22; Eph. 1:13, 14; Rom. 5:1-5.

Holy Spirit, Blasphemy Against. I would like to ask you a question or two for my own benefit, and the first is, What is blasphemy against the Holy Ghost that there is no forgiveness for? and second, I would like to have you harmonize these Scriptures; that is, the sin against the Holy Ghost given by three of the Gospels (Matt 12:31, 32; Mark 3:28, 29; Luke 12:10 and 1 John 5:16), on the first part with the second part; that is, the commission given by Christ to the apostles recorded in Mark 16:15, 16 and Rev. 22:16, 17. Do these Scriptures seem to conflict? Please harmonize and favor a friend. J. T. McCoy.

The sin against the Holy Spirit, whatever form it may take on, is essentially a willful and deliberate sin against light and knowledge. The Holy Spirit is the Revealer and Demonstrator of truth. Every one who rejects the truth resists the Spirit (Acts 7:51, 52), and every one who deliberately rejects the clearest revelations of the truth, as the Jews did when they attributed the miracles of Jesus to Satan, sins against the Holy Spirit. Such rejections of truth leave no space for repentance, for they so wrench and pervert the moral powers as to render one incapable of repentance. A triumph over the highest and strongest motives of the gospel leaves nothing capable of leading one to repentance. That is the reason why this sin hath never forgiveness.

The passages you refer to offer salvation on condition

of faith, repentance and baptism. Salvation is not bestowed on the unbelieving and impenitent. Hence, there is no conflict between the passages. Any one who will believe and repent gives evidence in so doing that he has not committed the sin against the Holy Spirit.

Holy Spirit, Gift vs. Baptism. 1. Is the gift of the Holy Ghost, as promised in the thirty-eighth verse of second chapter of Acts, the same as the baptism of the Holy Ghost? or is it a something that penitent believers in our day may expect to receive on condition of their being baptized? If the latter, is it direct from heaven, as miracle? and is the newborn soul conscious of its reception? Please let us hear your comment, that may throw some light on that subject.

2. Also, your version of the forty-fourth verse of the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. If the physical man is to rise, how dispose of this verse? If a spiritual body is to be resurrected from the grave, where is its abode during the intervening ages between the death of the natural body and the resurrection?

NEW GARDEN, O. JAMES BALL.

1. The gift if the Holy Spirit, as promised in Acts 2:38, must be regarded as the ordinary gift which is bestowed upon the penitent believer *now* as *then*. The baptism of the Holy Spirit may be fairly interpreted to mean those extraordinary outpourings which were accompanied with *sensible signs,* perceptible to both the subjects of it, and to others in their presence; as, for instance, the case of those assembled in the upper room, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:2-4); that of Cornelius and they who, with him, heard the word (10:44-48); and that of the disciples whom Paul found at Ephesus, who had been only baptized unto John's baptism (19:1-3). In all these cases there were miraculous evidences of the presence and power of the Spirit, and, as the power of speaking in tongues and prophesying, etc., was *preternatural,* and its effects sensuous, we may conclude that the subjects of this power were *conscious* of it.

But of the ordinary gift of the Spirit, there being no sensible effect or impression, it can not be properly said that it is *miraculous*. As the power of the kingdom of God within the soul, it cometh without observation; yet we are *conscious* of these spiritual states and dispositions, which are caused in us by its power, and so *may* be said "to know that we have passed from death unto life," and that Christ abideth in us by the spirit which he hath given us (1 John 3: 14-24). Of course the gift of the Holy Spirit can only come "from heaven." If by *"direct"* our querist means "in a straight line," we answer, we can not tell! If he means the gift is bestowed through some medium, we ask through what medium? The word? Is not the Holy Spirit the inspirer of the word? How was he given before the word, of which he is the source, was spoken as to the apostles? If it be meant that certain conditions of faith, repentance and baptism must precede the gift, then we say the Scripture answer is plain. If it be said that in giving his word, he gives himself, then in what sense does the Christian receive the gift of the Spirit, any more than the sinner? The gift is real and personal, or else the language of Scripture is delusive, and the promise an empty metaphor. But this it were sacrilege to assert.

2. By a "spiritual body" we must understand a body *adapted* to the spirit, not *made* of spirit as to its substance. Body and spirit are distinguished as opposite in point of substance—but, metaphorically, we express our conception of highly refined material organisms by calling them *spiritual*. To use this term literally as a modifier of the term *body*, would be a contradiction in terms —to confound as *one* and *identical two* things different and opposed in substance. In the *natural* body we feel the burden and the chains of our bondage. The divine

aspirations of the soul are fettered, and falter on unsteady wing; but in the *spiritual* body we shall be under the dominance of the spiritual power, and free to soar or rest, as the spirit prompts us. But it is not a spiritual body while in the grave. It is made so in the resurrection.

Holy Spirit, Helping and Interceding. Please to answer the following questions on Rom. 8:26, 27:

1. How does the "Spirit help our infirmities," when "we know not what we should pray for as we ought" to pray?

2. Does the twenty-sixth verse teach that the Holy Spirit is an *intercessor* for saints, and, if so, *with whom* does he intercede? Have saints two intercessors—Christ and the Holy Spirit? See verse 27.

3. What means the expression, "The mind of the Spirit," in verse 27?

If the twenty-sixth verse teaches that the Holy Spirit is an intercessor, and the twenty-seventh verse that Christ is one also, then there is a difference between the work of an intercessor and a mediator, for there is "one mediator between God and men."

1. By interceding for us.

2. Yes. Christ is our intercessor in the heavens; the Holy Spirit intercedes in us. Christians are taught to make intercession for all men (1 Tim. 2:1). Does this interfere with the intercessions of Christ? Moreover, the Spirit in his mission is a servant of Christ—sent by him—and the Spirit's intercessions are part of the intercessory work of Christ.

3. The *intention* of the Spirit. When we do not know what to pray for, the Spirit helps our infirmities by presenting our plea in unutterable groanings—groanings and sighings produced in us, yet to us no definite expression of desire; but the searcher of hearts understands what is meant by these utterances, although they take no form in words.

The twenty-seventh verse does not teach that Christ is an intercessor, but it is taught elsewhere. Intercession is only a part of mediation. Mediation includes the entire work of Christ in representing our nature and its wants and interests to God, and the divine nature and character to man.

It is no interference with the personal intercessions of Christ in heaven that the Spirit in us produces such appeals to God in the unutterable groanings of a distressed and bewildered sufferer, as make them more than a merely human prayer. And it ought to be a great comfort to know that when we lie dumb and confounded before God, the groanings of our nature, so indefinite in meaning to us, are an intelligible prayer of the Spirit to God.

Holy Spirit, How Received. 1. In Gal. 4:6, I read, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." The Spirit promised there—do persons receive it independent of, or through, the words of the Spirit?

2. Is not Rom. 8:15 a parallel passage?

3. The promise that Peter gave on the day of Pentecost, "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," does it hold good to-day, or did it stop with the miracles?

Was it not fulfilled when the apostles laid their hands on persons and they received the Holy Spirit? J. W. R.

1. Paul teaches in the same Epistle (2:14) that we receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. We learn the promise in the word, and believe it; thus far it is received through the word. But that the actual impartation of the Spirit is always through the word is more than the language of Paul will warrant.

2. Yes, it is as nearly parallel as any passage we know of.

3. It holds good to-day, just as certainly as the prom-

ise of remission of sins holds good. It may have been fulfilled, in part, through the laying on of hands—that is, in so far as anything miraculous can be called a fulfillment of these promises. But it does not necessarily involve anything miraculous. That which was miraculous was for special objects and a special time; but the "Spirit of adoption," the earnest of our inheritance, is for all believers and for all time, and therefore natural.

Holy Spirit, Pray for. In a social prayer-meeting, where is it wrong, if at all, to pray the Lord to pour out the Holy Spirit upon his children? H.

The pouring out of the Spirit marked *the beginning of the reign of the Messiah,* and was attended and attested by supernatural phenomena and demonstrations of power. See Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:1-21; 10:44-46. There were to be such revelations and communications of the Spirit as had never been known before. See John 7:39. But the Holy Spirit once given, and the beginning of a spiritual dispensation once heralded and attested by these outpourings, the Spirit was to *remain* in the church and in the hearts of believers as a perpetual guest. The promise is, "He will abide with you forever." See John 14:16; Gal. 4:6; 1 Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:21, 22. The Spirit came to *abide;* if we do not enjoy the presence of the Spirit, it is not because he has withdrawn from the earth, but because we have grieved him away from our hearts (Eph. 4:30). There is no need to pray that the Spirit may be poured out from heaven, but that we may be prepared to receive the Spirit, who is ever present in the church, the body of Christ. We do not think that the Lord would make a man an offender for a word; he knows what his children mean when they pray for the Spirit to be poured out on them; nevertheless, the form

of expression is based on a misconception of the Holy Spirit's mission. The Spirit came after Jesus went away, and will remain until the close of this dispensation and coming of Christ.

Holy Spirit, Paul's Reception of. We (the Disciples) teach that there are but two cases in the New Testament of "baptism of the Holy Ghost." If this be true, how did Saul of Tarsus (Paul) receive the Holy Ghost? Please answer through the STANDARD. I ask you this question at the request of a Methodist gentleman who has been baptized, and is in sympathy with us—a great Bible student, a ripe scholar, but can not interpret Paul's case to coincide with our views. S. M. MARTIN.
ANTIOCH, O.

The impartation of the Holy Spirit to Saul, so far as miraculous endowments are concerned, was, we take it, through the laying on of the hands of Ananias, who was specially commissioned by Jesus Christ to confer this power (Acts 9: 17). The Spirit was bestowed mediately, through the ministration of Ananias, not immediately from heaven, as in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius.

What we say is, that the two cases referred to are the only cases spoken of as baptism in the Holy Spirit. There are many among us, however, who regard this case of Saul's and that of the twelve of Ephesus as additional instances of Spirit baptism. The true distinction is, that the results of the baptism in the Spirit were miraculous, while the ordinary gift of the Spirit promised to the obedient—the Spirit of adoption—does not involve the supernatural element. Whether we call the case of Saul a baptism in the Spirit, or not, is a question simply involving the distinction between a power immediately communicated from heaven, or a power mediately conferred through human ministration. The *result* is the same.

Holy Spirit, Renewing of. 1. Is "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. 3:5) the same as the operation of the Spirit on the sinner's mind, through the word of God, producing faith, etc.?

2. Does the purifying of the heart, named in Acts 15:9, mean the same as the purification of the soul by obedience, mentioned in 1 Pet. 1:22?

3. Does not every proper subject of baptism have a *good conscience* before his baptism? If so, is it not incorrect to use the word "obtaining" for the word "answer" used by Peter in his first letter, third chapter and twenty-first verse? W.

1. There is some difficulty in deciding this point, and the grammatical construction of the sentence does not relieve it. If the renewal of the Holy Spirit be interpreted of the gift of the Spirit bestowed after baptism, then the phrase "bath of regeneration"—which is almost universally taken to mean baptism—must be regarded as comprehending all that of which it is but the consummation; namely, faith and repentance. For this there is no warrant except the necessity imposed by referring the renewal of the Holy Spirit to a later stage in the process. Note, however, two or three things: (1) The apostle is treating of *salvation* from sin—of *justification* by God's mercy; and not of the subsequent spiritual life. (2) The *result* of the renewal of the Holy Spirit is that we are "*justified* freely by his grace." (3) The fact that the bath of regeneration is first mentioned is in accordance with our Lord's own style—"born of water and of the Spirit." We are inclined, therefore, to regard the renewal or new moulding accomplished by the Spirit as referring to the work of the Spirit in conversion, which necessarily precedes the bath of regeneration, and as of the same import as our Lord's phrase, "born or begotten of the Spirit," in John 3. (5) This Spirit, which was richly poured out on the day of Pentecost, began that

day his work of convicting the world of sin, righteousness and judgment through the gospel which the apostles preached.

2. Yes, about the same. The text in Acts 15:9 has an idea which we never see brought out. It is not purifying their hearts *by faith,* but purifying their hearts by *the faith*—by the gospel. The phrase *"the faith"* comprehends all that is stated in 1 Pet. 1:22.

3. He may have had fifty good consciences before baptism, or five hundred—that is to say, his conscience may have approved him in that many acts of his life; but a good conscience, in Peter's sense of the term, is a conscience purged from sin—a pacified conscience, such as is only enjoyed rightly by him who has the evidence that his sins are all forgiven. There is much dispute over the term used by Peter—as to whether it means asking, seeking, obtaining or answering. *Eperotema* is simply the inquiry—the seeking—after a good conscience toward God.

Holy Spirit Works Change in Man. My husband takes the STANDARD, and I would be glad if you would favor me by letting me know in your answers to inquirers, in what way you differ with the Baptists about the way the Holy Spirit works to bring sinners to Jesus. For instance: When a sinner repents of all his sins, and puts his trust in Jesus to save him, and wants to serve God the balance of his life, would you say the Holy Spirit wrought that change in him? M. C.

Certainly we would say the Holy Spirit wrought the change. It is the mission of the Spirit to convict men of sin, righteousness and judgment. No man can properly call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Spirit. The difference is *as to the mode of the Spirit's operations.* The Baptists (many of them) regard this repentance and trust in Jesus as wrought in the sinner by a direct and immediate

operation of the Spirit on the sinner's heart—by a miracle, in fact, new-creating him and imparting faith to him. We teach that, in accomplishing this change, the Spirit *operates through the truth,* so that the sinner is born again by the word of God. Other Baptists, who admit that the Spirit operates through the truth, still insist that the word of truth is a dead letter until the Spirit takes it, and by a special influence applies it. We believe and teach that the word of God is *living* and *powerful,* as Paul says; that the Spirit is ever in and with it; and that as to *applying* the truth, this is the work of the church, through her members and her ministry. If the Spirit dwells in them, and they, filled with the Spirit, labor to instruct and warn their fellow-men, the truth is in this way applied.

Let us add that if the sinner is only brought to trust in Christ and turn from his sins, we are not much concerned about any particular theory of conversion. It is only when these theories hinder sinners from repenting and turning to God, that we are disposed to combat them; because they lead sinners to expect a miraculous change which they fail to experience, and are thus, notwithstanding their faith and repentance, afraid to take a single step further in obedience to Christ.

Horesty, Is It Enough? There is a gentleman in our town, and of no mean ability, who is teaching publicly and privately that all people who worship God sincerely and honestly, and according to the best light they have, will go to heaven. Please inform us in your next STANDARD which of the apostles preached this gospel, with probable consequences, was it Saul or Tarsus? and oblige many subscribers. EDWARD RIGGS.
CALIFORNIA, Pa.

This is not a question of gospel teaching. The gospel reveals a definite way of salvation, and teaches us how

we must live so as to please God. Its promises of divine acceptance here, and of eternal life hereafter, rest on certain conditions, and can be justly appropriated only by those who comply with these conditions. See Mark 16: 15, 16; with John 3: 5; 2 Pet. 1: 5-11. This salvation, here and hereafter, rests on the work of Christ, and is offered in his name, to those who trust in and serve him as their Mediator and Sovereign (Acts 4: 12; 1 Tim. 2: 5; Acts 13: 38-41).

There is a question, however, outside of this; namely, What about those who have not the gospel, but who walk honestly in the light they have? This is a question to be settled in the light of general principles, and not in the light of gospel requirements; for these latter always carry with them the implication that those who are saved or condemned by the gospel *have an opportunity to know the gospel,* and voluntarily accept or reject it. There are some Scripture teachings which may legitimately apply in answering this question, going to show that God will judge every one in the light of his opportunities and ability to know and understand the will of God. How many of such the righteous Judge will save, He only knows; and to make *an opinion* on this subject take the place of the gospel of Christ is certainly unwarranted and may be very mischievous. We need not fear to leave all such in the hands of the just and merciful God. The Judge of all the earth will do right. Our business is to preach the gospel and insist on obedience to it.

Husband and Wife, Separation of. 1. Can a congregation Scripturally permit the peaceable separation of husband and wife, both members, on the ground (1) of incompatibility; or (2) a failure on the husband's part, through indolence, to provide a sufficient support?

2. The church having permitted the separation, can the wife, on the ground urged above for separation, or on any other than the ground of adultery, sue for and obtain a divorce, and at the same time remain a member of the congregation, though she declares it her intention to remain unmarried? A DISCIPLE.

1. Paul (1 Cor. 7: 10-12) says: "Let not the wife depart from her husband, and let not the husband put away his wife." This is the rule. It was said to Christian husbands and wives. The consideration of the cases of such Christians as had heathen consorts, is found in subsequent verses. The *rule* is against separation, and our counsels and efforts should be governed by this rule. But the rule is not without exceptions. "But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." This, Paul says, was said by the Lord, as well as by himself. Accordingly we read (Mark 10: 11, 12): "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *and marry another,* committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, *and marry another,* she committeth adultery." See also Luke 16: 18. The additional clause in Matt. 19: 9, "except it be for fornication," teaches that in case of fornication the injured party has not only a right to put the offender away, but to marry another; whereas in cases of putting away for other causes, there is no liberty to marry again.

We conclude, then, that there are extreme cases in which, according to Jesus and Paul, married persons may separate, provided they do not marry again. There are cases of wrong and of sin so hopeless of remedy that the suffering party has a right to claim release from it; and cases where both parties are such a constant source of wretchedness to each other, that for the sake of peace and for deliverance from sin, it is better for them to live amicably apart than quarrelsomely together. But such

separations should always be with the advice and consent of the church, that no occasion be given to the enemy to speak reproachfully.

2. On this we are not so clear. Paul's language, "or be reconciled to her husband," does not look in the direction of divorce, and we would be slow to write a word that would encourage such a proceeding, unless it be where a legal divorce is the only legal protection against wrong and injury by an unscrupulous husband or wife. In such a case, where it is sought for legal protection only, and without intending to marry again, we are not prepared to condemn it. That is as far as we dare go. That it is certainly right, is more than we dare say.

Let us add, that if any wife is allowed by the church to separate from her husband on account of his failure to provide for her, the lazy lout ought to be dealt with for his worse than infidelity. See 1 Tim. 5:8.

Immersion and Greek Church. I have been informed that there is a branch of the Catholic Church that practices immersion. Will you tell us whether this report is true? If so, in what nation are they to be found? J.

The Eastern or Greek Church, which claims to be the Catholic Church, and disputes the claims of the Western, or Latin, or Roman Catholic Church, practices immersion, and always has practiced it. In the Western Church, immersion is still practiced in the cathedral of Milan. Stanley says, in his "History of the Eastern Church":

"There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as

an exceptional, almost a monstrous, case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid. The Latin Church, on the other hand, doubtless in deference to the requirements of a northern climate, to the change of manners, to the convenience of custom, has wholly altered the mode, preferring, as it would fairly say, mercy to sacrifice; and (with the two exceptions of the cathedral of Milan and the sect of the Baptists) a few drops of water are now the Western substitute for the threefold plunge into the rushing rivers or the wide baptisteries of the East."—*Lecture I.*

Immersion in History. In a paper on the "History of Immersion and Sprinkling," in the *Christian Quarterly,* October, 1871, by A. S. Hale, I remember it was stated that originally the Presbyterians and Congregationalists immersed. Can you furnish the historical evidence for the truth of this statement?

The evidence was presented by Brother Hale in the essay referred to. We need do no more here than to repeat it.

Dr. Wall's testimony is: "All those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the bishops of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling. The English received not this custom—sprinkling—till after the decay of popery. But all other Christians in the world, who have never owned the Pope's usurped power, do and ever did dip."

Dr. Gale: "All men know that baptism was used to be administered in England by dipping or immersion till Queen Elizabeth's time—1558—since which time that pure, primitive manner is grown into a total disuse

within a little more than one hundred years, and sprinkling, the most opposite to it imaginable, introduced in its stead. The fact is notorious."

In the New Edinburgh Encyclopædia, Art. *Baptism* —edited by Sir David Brewster, a Presbyterian—we read: "It was not until the year 1311 that the legislature in the Council of Ravenna declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In Scotland, however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation—Lutheran, sixteenth century—and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI.—from 1547 to 1553—trine immersion was constantly practiced."

In Queen Mary's bloody reign, after the death of Edward VI., many nonconformists were driven into exile. At Geneva they learned from Calvin the substitution of sprinkling for immersion. When Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, these exiles returned, and reported in Scotland and England that the "famous, godly, learned man, John Calvin, had *improved* on *baptism*, and this *substitute* was not *half so troublesome*." The new practice gained ground, but not without much opposition. The bishops even preached before Parliament, trying to excite them to pass a law that should enforce sprinkling They urged the matter in such terms as these: "The devil of immersion ought to be legislated out of the realm, it is so troublesome." It was during the feeling and excitement consequent on these discussions of the bishops that what is known as the "Bishops' Bible" was published. Growing out of their desire and determination, if possible, to put down immersion, many perversions of passages relating to this ordinance found their way into the "Bishops' Bible." Nearly half a century after, when King James' translators sat down to their task, it was under these, among other, restrictions: "Keep as close as pos-

sible to the 'Bishops' Bible.' The old ecclesiastical words (of which *baptize* was one) must be kept."

The writer of the article from which we have quoted in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, after stating how sprinkling was introduced into Scotland and England from Geneva, says: "John Calvin was the first man among Protestants that changed the ordinance."

Dr. Wall says: "Pouring was the substitute for baptism which Calvin first adopted, and his *sprinkling* was only the *substitute of a substitute*, and was the most scandalous thing ever adopted for baptism." "The Presbyterian Church in Geneva is the first church on earth that ever *enjoined* sprinkling." He also says that in England "sprinkling, in 1645, was just beginning, and was used by very few."

The original law of Parliament, in 1534, enforced immersion. The act of Parliament of 1644 repealed so much of the old law as enforced immersion, and enforced sprinkling in its stead. The Presbyterian Church first began in England not far from 1541, and the Independents soon after. It was not until the decision of the Westminster Assembly, in 1643, by a vote of 25 to 24, excluded immersion, that the practice of immersion ceased among the Presbyterians. It is simply amazing that any man can know these facts, and still prate of *conscientious* opposition to immersion.

Immersion, Objection to. Please answer the following argument against baptism by immersion through the STANDARD, and oblige your sister in Christ.

1. "When the three thousand were converted in Jerusalem, they could not have been immersed, because there was not sufficient water at the command of the followers of Christ, for the water was in pools, and would not have been allowed to be used for that purpose."

2. Also, please tell us if you think it right for an elder to

urge the sisters to take part in the public meetings, when they are fully convinced by Paul's commandment that they "should keep silence in the assemblies," and that Paul did not permit them to speak in public.

We, a little handful of Christ's followers, are "earnestly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints," and are much encouraged by the weekly presence of your good paper.

WINFIELD, Kan. A. M.

1. It is not an argument at all, but simply a cavil. It has not the least force to prove that *baptizo* does not mean to immerse. If it could be shown that three thousand could not be immersed in Jerusalem in one day, and Luke affirms that three thousand were immersed, it would simply prove that Luke stated falsely. If I affirm that one man killed ten thousand men in half a minute, beheading each one separately, it is no use attempting to prove that beheading means sprinkling salt on their heads, and that kill means trick, just to save my reputation. The meaning of the words *kill* and *behead* must be settled by the standards of the language in which I speak; and if it is shown to be impossible that so many could be killed in that length of time, I am compelled to bear the charge of falsehood. Just so, if baptized means immersed, and Luke says there were three thousand immersed in one day, and it is shown that that was impossible, then the reputation of Luke suffers, but the meaning of *baptizo* is not at all changed.

But what is there impossible about the immersion of three thousand in one day—granting, for the sake of argument, that Luke makes this affirmation?

"The water was in pools." Very well—that was a good place for it to be. And of these pools, there was Bethesda, which we know was used for bathing by the people (John 5:2-4), which covered more than an acre of ground, was surrounded by five porches and accessible

to everybody. Then, there was the King's Pool, of which Robinson says there was water in it from one to three feet deep. Then, there was the pool of Siloam (John 9:7), of which Robinson says, "It is fifty-three feet long and eighteen broad, and even yet the water is two or three feet deep in it. The Old or Upper Pool was 316 feet long, 218 broad, and 18 feet deep. The pool of Hezekiah was 240 feet long, 144 broad, and the bottom slopes." Have we said enough about pools? We have not told all that we can tell, but enough is enough.

The Jews came up to the passover every year, hundreds of thousands of them. They all had to be cleansed. Their cleansing required *bathing* (see Num. 19). Does any one suppose that where there was water enough for hundreds of thousands to *bathe,* there was not water enough for three thousand to be immersed? Nonsense.

But the pools "would not have been allowed to be used for that purpose." But we have already shown, by Scripture reference to two of these pools, that they were used for such a purpose. Is it said that the Jews would not have allowed these Christians to use them? We answer, that as yet no line was drawn between them and others (see Acts 2:47). Even when the rulers began to persecute them, "the people" were so much in their favor that the rulers dare not proceed against them (Acts 4:21; 5:26).

Is it objected that twelve men could not immerse them in one day? We see not why. But suppose they could not, there were 120 disciples there (Acts 1:15), and any or all of these could baptize by apostolic direction.

Immersion, Trine, Early Writers on. A reader of the STANDARD has been reading a "History of the Modes of Christian Baptism," and finds therein some things that doubtless are

not new to you, and upon which he would like to have you comment.

Among the authors named in this history I quote only a few, and as briefly as I can:

From writers in the first century he quotes Dionysius as follows: "The symbolic teaching, therefore, mystically instructs him who is to be baptized according to sacred rite, to imitate, by *the three immersions in water,* the death and burial for three days and nights of Jesus, the Life-giver, for it is conceded to men to imitate him."

Tertullian, in the second century, says: "He (Christ) gave, as his last command, that they should immerse into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, not into one person. For we are immersed not once, but thrice, at the naming of every person of the Trinity."

In the third century, Cyril of Jerusalem writes: "And each of you was asked whether he believed in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and ye made that saving confession, and descended three times into the water and ascended again," etc. Basil, who, I believe, was bishop of Cæsarea, says: "In three immersions, therefore, and in the same number of invocations, the great mystery of baptism is finished."

Chrysostom, in the fourth century, in writing of baptism, makes it appear to be immersion, and says, "This is done thrice, that you may learn that the power of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost fulfilleth all this."

This author of this history testifies that Eunomius, an Arian, was probably the first to teach and practice *single* immersion, and that Gregory the Great was the first orthodox minister or bishop who sanctioned this innovation. I find also that in the time of Edward VI. the baptismal service of the Church of England reads, "Then shall the priest take the child in his hands, and, naming the child, *shall dip* it in the water *thrice*," etc.

There are numerous other references, but these are sufficient. I doubt not there are many, like myself, not connected with the church, who would like to know what the "one baptism" is, and whether, if immersion, it is trine immersion.

Certainly if the latter was the mode among Christians of the first centuries, those who desire to follow only the primitive forms will not object to having the truth.

1. There is no Christian author of the first century by the name of Dionysius. Mosheim says, in writing of the third century:

"The vicious inclination to circumvent and confound an adversary, rather than confute him with sound argument, produced also a multitude of books bearing on their front the names of distinguished men. For the greater part of mankind being influenced more by the authority of names than by arguments and Scriptural testimony, the writers conceived they must prefix names of the greatest weight to their books, in order to oppose successfully their adversaries. Hence those *Canons* which were falsely ascribed to the apostles; hence those *Apostolic Constitutions* which Clemens Romanus was reputed to have collected; hence, too, the *Recognitions of Clement,* as they are called, and the *Clementina,* which a too credulous world long held in high estimation. By the same artifice, the *Mystics,* as they are called, sought to advance their cause. Having no answer to give to those who demanded who was the first author of this new sort of wisdom, they alleged that they received it from *Dionysius,* the Areopagite of Athens, a contemporary with the apostles; and to give plausibility to the falsehood, they palmed upon this great man books void of sense and rationality."

In a note, after mentioning the works attributed to Dionysius, Mosheim says:

"It is supposed they were written in the fourth or fifth century, as they bear marks of that period, and are not mentioned by any writer prior to the *sixth* century. During the Middle Ages they were held in high estimation, and their genuineness scarcely, if at all, questioned. The more devout Catholics and most of the early Protestants received them and relied upon them as

genuine. In the seventeenth century their spuriousness was abundantly demonstrated, and they are now universally regarded as supposititious."

But we presume the reference in the article of our correspondent is to Dionysius Exiguus, who belonged to the *sixth* century, in place of the *first*. Schaff says of the so-called Apostolical Canons:

"They were collected either after the middle of the fouth century, or not till the latter part of the fifth, *by some unknown hand,* probably in Syria. The Greek Church, at the Tullan Council of 692, adopted the whole collection of eighty-five canons as authoritative and binding. The Latin Church rejected it at first, but subsequently decided for the smaller collection of fifty canons which Dionysius Exiguus translated from a Greek manuscript about the year 500."

No difference which Dionysius the book referred to by our querist professes to quote, it will be seen that only by fraud can it be linked with the first century.

Tertullian, who belonged to the latter part of the second century and the beginning of the third century, is the first that mentions trine immersion; and on his testimony we remark:

1. He does not pretend that trine immersion is taught in the New Testament, but intimates, on the contrary, that it is rather more than the Lord prescribed. Here is Dr. Conant's translation of one of Tertullian's sentences:

"Then we are three times immersed, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the gospel."

We know there is some little dispute about the meaning of this sentence, but its most obvious meaning will not be disputed when we state

2. That Tertullian distinctly admits this practice to be without Scriptural authority, and rests it entirely on

tradition. We refer to Dr. Wall's "History of Infant Baptism" for decisive proof on this point. Tertullian argues for trine immersion *on the same ground,* and *for the same reasons* that he argues for the use of the sign of the cross, the use of honey, and the anointing with oil in connection with baptism—that is, on the ground of *tradition.* When we get to Tertullian's time, we get to so many admitted corruptions of doctrine and practice, that no practice can be proved to be divine on the unsupported testimonies of that age.

Now as to Eunomius, the opposition to the one immersion practiced by him was (1) because he was an Arian, and his repudiation of trine immersion was regarded as inimical to the doctrine of the Trinitarians; (2) because he baptized only into the death of Christ, and not into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit; (3) he immersed only the upper part of the body, plunging the candidate head foremost to the waist, and then drawing him out. It was not merely a dispute between one and three immersions. The friends of one immersion would have repudiated such a baptism. That the Catholics were governed in their opposition to the baptism practiced by Eunomius, not by the invalidity of one immersion, but by its bearing on the Trinitarian doctrine, shown by the fact that when trine immersion in the hands of the Arians was made to tell against Trinitarianism, the Catholics rejected it, and with the approval of Pope Gregory practiced only one immersion. But it is a misleading statement to say that Eunomius is the first mentioned as practicing single immersion. The truth is that nothing but simple immersion, without the trine, is ever mentioned until the time of Tertullian, at the beginning of the third century.

Dr. Wall, an evident friend of trine immersion, ad-

mits that it "is not mentioned in any command of our Saviour or the apostles recorded in the New Testament;" and, further, that "the Catholics, though they judged the trine immersion to have been in use from the beginning [on such fraudulent testimonies as those attributed to Dionysius and Clement.—Ed.], yet, *since it is not found to be enjoined by Christ nor his apostles,* did not count it absolutely necessary to baptism."

Dr. Schaff says:

"The old practice of a threefold immersion, *which is first mentioned by Tertullian,* is a venerable usage, *but can not be traced to the apostolic age,* nor is it at all required by the Trinitarian formula."

Ancient testimonies are good when they are brought to support *Scriptural usage;* but when urged as authority for that which Christ and the apostles never taught, they are not worth a straw.

Immersion, Trine. Having heard a Dunkard preach some two weeks ago, and in proof of trine immersion, he said: "In the Campbell and Rice debate, Mr. Campbell, in proof for immersion, referred to the Greek Church. On which Mr. Rice replied, 'If you go to the Greek Church to prove immersion, you will have to dip three times, for they practice trine immersion.' And Mr. Rice further said: 'If you take the liberty to drop from three to one immersion, you should be liberal enough to grant us the privilege to drop from one immersion to sprinkling,' which," said he, "so confounded Mr. Campbell that he was compelled to close the debate." Now, what I wish to know is this: Is it a fact that Mr. Campbell was unable to meet the argument and was compelled to close the debate?

Mr. Rice sought to break the force of Mr. Campbell's witnesses against pouring and sprinkling by stating that his witnesses bore testimony to *trine immersion,* and raised the argument mentioned by our querist. But Mr.

Rice did not admit that there was any testimony for trine immersion before the third century. He said, in his tenth address (p. 169): "No one can find any account of the practice of immersion before the third century; and then we find *trine* immersion, accompanied with various superstitions and some indecencies," etc. In his next speech Mr. Rice (p. 177) repeats his assertion, that immersion can not be found in the history of the church earlier than the third century. "The first writer who mentions it is Tertullian, who flourished in the beginning of the third century, and he informs us that the practice then was *trine immersion,* accompanied with the sign of the cross, the use of honey, oil, and the indecent practice of entirely disrobing the persons, male and female! Will my friend take Tertullian as his witness? . . . Will the gentleman, then, agree to take *the trine immersion of Tertullian,* with the accompanying ceremonies? No—he must cut off two immersions," etc. As to "closing the debate," each party made seven speeches after this. But Mr. Campbell, at that stage of the discussion, was presenting a regular chain of historical testimonies, and did not stop to notice much that Mr. Rice said, until his regular argument was completed. Moreover, the parties came into a close wrestle over the testimony of Stokius, the most exciting portion of the discussion, in which Mr. Rice made the most desperate efforts to escape from the choking clutch of his antagonist, and this also led to the postponement of a notice on the part of Mr. Campbell, of minor matters. But, in his seventeenth address, Mr. Campbell (p. 248) did reply to Mr. Rice on this point, as follows:

"The gentleman tells you of the trine immersion of Tertullian, and of their baptizing persons not only into each of the names of the Divinity, but also undressed!

And what have we to do with these eccentricities? It only makes the argument stronger; for, if they thus submitted to three immersions instead of one, how strong their faith in immersion! The gospel commands one immersion, but it seems they got to three."

Mr. Rice repeated his objections in his seventeenth reply, to which Mr. Campbell replied in his eighteenth and last speech as follows:

"To resume the argument from history, the gentleman will have Tertullian to be a sort of contemporary with the origin of immersion. Trine immersion he ought to have said, for trine immersion and *katadusis*, as a favorite word with one or two Greek Fathers, were indeed contemporaries. But Tertullian denies that three immersions (not one immersion) had an ancient origin. Sprinkling was never heard of until A. D. 251. I am truly astonished at such assertions (Dr. Rice's assertion that immersion was never heard of until *trine* immersion appeared), in the face of all our ecclesiastical writers."

As this was Mr. Campbell's last speech, he could not of course reply to Mr. Rice, in what he afterward said in his closing speech; but Mr. Rice's closing speech contains no such statements as our querist refers to—they were made in his tenth and eleventh speeches, and were replied to.

The debate on the question of the action of baptism closed by limitation—the time allotted to it having expired. Anybody, therefore, who says that Mr. Campbell closed the debate to get rid of the necessity of replying to Mr. Rice's arguments, is professedly ignorant of the facts in the case, or else willfully misrepresents the facts.

Immersion, Trine, Origin. Are there any ancient histories which say that trine immersion was practiced as early as A. D. 52 to A. D. 150? If so, (1) please name some such histo-

ries; (2) are there any histories to the contrary? (3) if the apostles baptized by trine immersion, should not we?

This, with several other inquiries of a similar character which have come in here recently, calls for a repetition of statements made in previous years, and which we hope all who are interested in them will preserve, that we may not have to repeat them too often.

1. No. The earliest witnesses that can be produced are Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, who belonged to the third century. Dr. Schaff, eminent alike as an ecclesiastical historian and a Biblical critic, says:

"The old practice of a threefold immersion, *which is first mentioned by Tertullian,* is a venerable usage, *but can not be traced to the apostolic age,* nor is it at all required by the Trinitarian formula." (Note on Matt. 28: 19, in Lange's Com.)

(1) As to Tertullian, he does not pretend that trine immersion is taught in the New Testament, but quite the contrary. As translated by Dr. Conant, he says: "Then we are three times immersed, *answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the gospel.*" We know there is some little dispute about the meaning of this sentence, but its most obvious meaning will not be disputed when we state

(2) That Tertullian distinctly admits this practice to be without Scriptural authority, and rests it entirely on tradition. See Dr. Wall on this point.

(3) He argues for trine immersion *on the same ground* and for the same reasons that he argues for the sign of the cross, the use of honey, and the anointing with oil in connection with baptism—that is, on the ground of *tradition.*

Dr. Wall admits that trine immersion "is not mentioned in any command of our Saviour or the apostles

recorded in the New Testament;" and further, that "the Catholics, though they judged the trine immersion to have been in use from the beginning, yet, *since it is not found to be enjoined by Christ, nor his apostles,* did not count it absolutely necessary to baptism."

Much use is attempted to be made of the fact that when Eunomius practiced single immersion, the Catholics opposed him. But we remark (1) that Sozomen, on whose authority the statement is made, does not stand high as an historian. (2) The opposition of the Catholics was largely owing to the fact that Eunomius was an Arian, and his repudiation of trine immersion was regarded as inimical to the doctrine of the Trinitarians, and because he immersed only the upper part of the body, plunging the candidate head foremost to the waist, and then drawing him out. It was not merely a dispute between one and three immersions. The friends of single immersion would have repudiated such a performance. That the Catholics were governed, in their opposition to the baptism taught by Eunomius, not by the invalidity of one immersion, but by its bearing on the Trinitarian doctrine, is shown by the fact that when trine immersion in the hands of the Arians was made to tell against Trinitarianism, the Catholics rejected it, and, with the approval of Pope Gregory, practiced only one immersion. (3) The time when Eunomius flourished is too far removed from apostolical times to allow any weight to the alleged facts in his case. The historical rise of trine immersion belongs to a date when departures from apostolic faith and practice were numerous.

Immersion, Trine, Valid. You will confer a favor by answering the following queries through the STANDARD:

1. It is well known that the trine immersionists (Dunkards) believe that faith, repentance, confession and baptism are es-

sential to salvation from sin. They baptize for the remission of sins, believing baptism to be essential to pardon.

Now, then, in case a person has been thus baptized, and afterward desires to unite with the Christian Church, can he be received upon his baptism, pleading that it was for the remission of sins? Is it therefore valid?

2. What dates should properly be assigned to the origin of sprinkling and pouring?

1. Our opinion is that it ought to be recognized as valid, not because it was administered for the remission of sins—for sprinkling might be administered for the same purpose—but because it is *immersion* into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

2. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," says of immersion: "They observed the way of baptizing all persons naked and divested, by a total immersion under water, except in some particular cases of great exigence, wherein they allowed of sprinkling, as in the case of clinic baptism, or where there was a scarcity of water." "There are a great many passages in the Epistles of St. Paul which plainly refer to this custom: Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12. And as this was the original apostolical practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the church for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the apostles." "Indeed, the church was so punctual to this rule, that we never read of any exception to it in ordinary cases, no, not even in the baptism of infants."

Clinic baptism can be traced back to the middle of the third century, as in the case of Novatian. Immersion continued to be the uniform practice until about the twelfth century, when the Western church began to countenance sprinkling and pouring.

Immersion Universally Accepted. 1. Does the Presbyterian Church, or any other Protestant sect, deny that immersion in water of a penitent believer into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is Christian baptism?

2. If so, has it, as a body, ever believed that immersion was baptism?

1. No. There are men of every sect, perhaps, who deny that the Scriptures teach immersion; but even these will not deny that immersion, all other things being right, is acceptable baptism. These are the extremists. Very generally, the candid and well-read of all parties are free to admit not only that immersion will do, but that it was for ages the universal practice of Christendom. The Quakers deny that water baptism has any Scriptural authority.

2. Presbyterians, as a body, never committed themselves against immersion. In the Westminster Assembly, however, they committed themselves to sprinkling as sufficient, and by excluding from their Directory for Worship the "dipping" which had previously been ordered in the service of the Established Church, they practically excluded immersion from the Presbyterian Church. It was not on the ground that immersion was not baptism. We are not aware that any one took that ground. But the ground was that sprinkling was sufficient. Even on that ground, it was a tie vote whether immersion should be excluded from their practice; and those who voted to exclude it did not thereby say that immersion was not baptism, but simply that sprinkling was sufficient.

Immortality, God Only Hath. Give an explanation of 1 Tim. 6:15, 16, and Rom. 2:7. If we possess immortality, why should we seek for it? And if God alone hath immortality, then we have it not.

The remark of Justin Martyr is in point here: "God

is said only to have immortality, because he hath it not by the will of another, as the rest who possess it, but of his own proper essence." Created beings, even if they were created immortal, *derive* their immortality from the Creator. See Rev. 15:4: "For thou only art holy." Does this prove that none others possess holiness? Certainly not; but their holiness is *derived*. The Greek *aphtharsia*, in Rom. 2:7, is *incorruptibility*. Compare 1 Cor. 15: 42, 50, 53, 54.

Infant Baptism, Origin of. Will you be so kind as to answer the following through the STANDARD: When did "infant baptism" begin, and where? If there is anything definite in history about this question, you will do me a great kindness to give it in the STANDARD. It has been said that no man could tell when and where it began, unless it was ordained by Jesus or his apostles.

The following, which we have just clipped from an exchange, gives, in small space and from eminent pedobaptist authority, what our querist wishes to know:

"Of infant baptism, the present Church of England Bishop of Salisbury has said: 'I must candidly and broadly state my conviction that there is no one passage or word in Scripture which directly proves it; not one word the undeniable and logical power of which can be adduced to prove, either in any way of fact, that, in the Scriptural age, infants were baptized, or of doctrine that they ought to be baptized. Nor, I believe, is there any such direct statement to be found in any writings of the Fathers of the church before the latter end of the second century after Christ.'"

Does it follow, because we can not put our finger on the first instance of the use of spittle, or many other human corruptions, that therefore it was apostolic? That

is a novel style of reasoning. What is not found in the New Testament has no divine authority.

Inspiration, Meaning of. Does the Scriptural meaning of inspiration necessarily imply the idea that the inspired, when speaking of things pertaining to the kingdom of God, must speak "as the Spirit gives them utterance"? If so, were Matthem, Mark, Luke and John all inspired? and, if so, why does Luke seemingly consider it necessary to be known that he "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first"?

Some of these writers were evidently inspired, as they were apostles to whom the Spirit was promised to guide them into all truth. But the fact that they were inspired does not imply that they were previously ignorant of all of which they wrote. On the contrary, one of the objects of inspiration was "to bring all things to their remembrance" which they had previously known. Luke, like the others, may have had "perfect understanding of all things from the very first," and yet have needed, like them, the guidance of the Spirit to bring these things to remembrance in an unmistakable way. It is true, however, that Luke does not claim inspiration as the basis of his ability to write accurately, and if inspiration is claimed for him, it must be on the internal evidence furnished in what he has written. It does not necessarily require inspiration to record inspired utterances accurately. If there is sufficient basis for confidence in him as a biographer, the inspiration we seek is to be found in the truths recorded, rather than in the recorder.

Insurance, Life, Is It Wrong? Is life insurance contrary to the spirit of the Scriptures?

Not any more than *fire* insurance. Not any more than a compliance with all the considerations of wisdom and prudence by which life may be prolonged. Not any more than laying up money yearly, to support one's fam-

ily in case of his death. We are not tempting or dishonoring *divine* providence by a strict regard to *human* providence. The care of God is invoked with the understanding we do all in our power to care for ourselves.

At the same time, we feel bound to say that there are very few life-insurance companies in which we would advise any one to invest.

Israel Finally Saved. Please explain Rom. 11:25-32. What is meant by "And so all Israel shall be saved"? Does it refer to the Jewish Israel? What does Paul mean by the "gifts and calling of God are without repentance"?

We can not avoid the conclusion that Israel in verse 26 is the same Israel to which blindness or hardening had happened (verse 25), and which in verse 28 are said to be enemies concerning the gospel, but beloved for the fathers' sakes. There is a something called "the fulness of the Gentiles" (v. 25; see, also, Luke 21:24). "The times of the Gentiles" we take to cover the period during which the Gentile nations are accepting the gospel; and "the fulness of the Gentiles" the completion of these times—the time when the Gentile nations (not all Gentiles individually) shall have accepted the Messiah. *Then* Jerusalem will no longer be trodden down of the Gentiles. *Then* the Jews, through the mercy of God to the Gentiles, will turn to Christ. "All Israel" does not mean all Jews individually, nor Jews of all ages, but the Jews, as a people, then living on the earth. "The gifts and calling of God" in behalf of his ancient covenant people are to undergo no change of purpose; therefore all that was spoken of them and promised to them will be fulfilled.

Jacob and Esau. Harmonize with the true principles of justice the words of the God of the Bible, viz.: "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Mal. 1:2, 3; Rom. 9:13).

The passage in Malachi clearly teaches two things:

1. That the language had not referred to Esau and Jacob personally, but to the nations that descended from them—Israelites and Edomites.

2. That what is called *love* for Jacob was the divine favor that preferred him as an inheritor of the Abrahamic covenant, and gave to his descendants a goodly heritage—a land of fruitfulness and beauty; while what is called *hate* of Esau is shown in appointing to his descendants an inferior heritage, and in making even that more desolate on account of their sins.

Hence it is evident that this preference of Jacob to Esau had nothing to do with the election of one to eternal life, or the rejection of the other to eternal condemnation.

The term *hate* does not necessarily mean what we call hate. It often means to *love less*. See Gen. 29:30, 31; Matt. 6:24; Luke 14:24; compare with Matt. 10:37. As love for Jacob was not a passion, but an enlightened preference of him over Esau for a certain honorable position, so hate of Esau is simply his rejection from that honor, and his appointment to an inferior place.

So far as reconciling this with justice is concerned, let it be observed that it is a dealing with *nations*, and only with individuals as representing nations. See Gen. 25:23; compare with Rom. 9:10-12. In selecting one child in preference to another, to accomplish a certain purpose in preparing the way for the coming of Christ, and one nation in preference to another to be used in preparing the way, as neither of them had any claim to the boon, God had a right to select which he pleased, and it pleased him to select the younger and reject the elder. It was not a question of justice at all, as neither had any claim of justice to urge in the case. If it be said that Esau, as the elder brother, had the right of primogeniture,

and was entitled to inherit the promises made to his father, we reply, (1) this peculiar honor did not belong to the rights of primogeniture; (2) if it had, Esau forfeited all such right by basely selling it for a mess of pottage. The notion that this was an election to eternal life should be dismissed. When that is dismissed, and it is seen that the election of Jacob and rejection of Esau had merely reference to a position and a work preparatory to the coming of Jesus for the salvation of all nations, the whole difficulty vanishes.

Jesuitism. In "The Church" column of the *Christian Union* we have these words:

"The *English Independent* says: 'The very heart sickens—the faith one would cherish in the progress of humanity and civilization is shaken—when we hear that an increase of nearly half a million of men is contemplated in the German army. There is no proof that Prince Bismarck likes this addition for its own sake. He believes it to be forced upon him by that great Jesuit plot which more or less involves every Continental kingdom in its vast reticulation of intrigues.'

"This Jesuit conspiracy is more than Continental; it is universal. The principles established by the Vatican council necessary involve it, and the great ecclesiastical council at Rome is, by a logical necessity, the enemy of all governments that refuse subordination and obedience to its mandates. We shall do well to consider the facts and warnings of Bismarck, in their relations to ourselves, in good season."

Do you regard this a fair statement of the condition of Papal and Protestant affairs?

As far as it goes, yes. The Jesuits are evidently the champions of the doctrines of the Dark Ages, and stubbornly and desperately and cunningly push the contest with the civilization of the nineteenth century. That they obtained complete possession of the Pope, and forced the issue of Papal infallibility, and that they are now busy with the politics of Europe, seeking to obtain control of

educational forces, and to stay the progress of religious liberty, is abundantly evident to the careful observer of events. An "Anglo-Saxon Catholic," writing in the *Independent,* in an appeal to the bishops, asks:

"Should not the Jesuits, who have been the culpable authors of all this disorder and misleading of nearly the whole Episcopate, be condemned with universal execration, struck from the roll of religious orders, and torn up like tares from the evangelical field, that their name may in all future time signify sacrilege, treason, abomination and infamy?"

When such language is used by Catholics themselves, we need not wonder that Protestants should use the language that our correspondent has quoted. The history of Jesuitism is a history of such dangerous and formidable intrigue that Catholic powers have been compelled many times to suppress the order. That they have survived all opposition, defy the disgrace that history puts upon them, and, by their centralized power, survive today to threaten the nations, is itself enough to quicken the suspicions of the Protestant nations. That they intended by the doctrine of infallibility to hold nations at the mercy of the Pope, whose infallible decision would, at any time, have more weight with his subjects than the laws of an empire or allegiance to a throne, is perfectly understood by Germany, Austria, and the European Governments generally. Germany, as an empire, is so nearly equally divided between Catholic and Protestant sentiment that the Jesuits have it in their power, not only to annoy, but to threaten, the existing authorities, and, by adroit legislation, to gain the advantage of their opponents. Bismarck has a difficult task on hand—one that will test his statesmanship to the last degree. Austria, too, labors under constant embarrassment from Jesuitical

intrigue. The real secret of the favor shown to the Old Catholic movement in Germany and Austria, and the refusal to respect Papal excommunications in regard to them, is found in the wish to popularize opposition to the Pope's infallibility, as a doctrine dangerous to the peace of the state. In France the Ultramontane party are constantly interfering in politics, strengthened in their purpose by the wrongs they suffered at the hands of the Communists; and Thiers is puzzled to know what to do. In Spain the Carlists have a similar inspiration. Telegraphic dispatches from Spain, of April 29, concerning the Carlist insurrection, contain the following:

"It is learned from prisoners captured that each band of insurrectionists has a priest at its head or among its officers."

The stubborn refusal of the Pope to accept anything at the hands of the King of Italy, is a piece of Jesuitical craft, designed to intensify the conflict over all Europe between the Ultramontanes and their opponents. We have said the Jesuits are the champions of the doctrines of the Dark Ages. If proof were needed of this, it is found even in American Catholic journals in abundance. The *Catholic Telegraph,* of this city, speaking of Mr. Van Meter's efforts in the city of Rome for the religious instruction of the children and the circulation of the Bible among the people, says:

"Van Meter need not fear the vengeance of the enslaved Catholics of Rome; but he has reason to dread the stiletto of some revolutionist, who, if he has abandoned God, may still love his children and his country. Men who have no scruple about the murder of an innocent fellow-being will not be very merciful to a prowling wolf. It would not surprise us to learn that Van Meter

had gone to Rome in search of a just reward, and to prepare his own funeral."

The *tone* of this is unmistakable. It is Jesuitical enough to shield, in advance, the Catholics from the design of murder, but evidently gloats over the prospect of the assassination of Van Meter for no other crime than that of seeking to lead the people to Christ.

We have frequently called attention to the opposition of the Pope and all his adherents, as well in this country as elsewhere, to freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, and free schools. This opposition is undisguised and positive. We fixed attention also on the fact that after the shameful riots in New York, the Catholic pulpits of this city were silent; the papers under control of Catholics in New York, with rare exceptions, were clamorous for vengeance on those who subdued the mob; and even the papers which most loudly condemned the mob, only argued for *toleration,* on the ground that the religious diversities in this country were such as to make toleration a necessity! The political sway obtained in New York City and over the New York Legislature by Roman Catholics, by which public property and public moneys were given freely into their possession, and the startling corruption which the foreign vote in New York City made possible and actual, furnishes another grave lesson.

We have no doubt of the loyal intentions of multitudes of Roman Catholics, nor would we fear any evil results were they left to be molded by the popular sentiment of the country. We hold them entitled to precisely the same rights as all others, and on precisely the same grounds. But that the *system* to which they adhere, and the *authorities* to which they owe supreme allegiance, are at war with the genius and spirit of our free institutions,

we are thoroughly convinced, and the lessons at present furnished by European statesmanship should be carefully noted for our own benefit.

Jesus, Priesthood of. In the *Evangelist,* issue December 3, we find it stated in an article on the "Baptism of Christ," that he was baptized to initiate him into his priestly office.

1. If this is so, how are we to understand Heb. 8:3, 4? When and where did he ever officiate upon earth as a priest?

2. Jesus was made a priest after the order of Melchizedeck, who was without (priestly) father or mother, beginning of days or end of life; Jesus being made a priest either on earth or in heaven, there must have been a time when it was done. Where is the analogy or similitude between the two?

1. The fact that Jesus did not *officiate* on earth as a high priest, would not prove that he was not *consecrated* to his priestly office on earth. On the other hand, the fact of his being baptized and anointed with the Holy Spirit, does not prove that he was thus and then initiated into his *priestly* office particularly, unless it is so stated. We are not aware of any text that so states. On the contrary, while it may be safe to regard his baptism and anointing as an introduction to his whole Messianic work as Prophet, Priest and King, there is no *special* reference to *priestly* work; but, so far as there is a specialty in the anointing, it relates to his prophetical work. See Luke 4:17-21; Acts 10:38. But, regarding his baptism and anointing as an initiation into his Messianic work—including the priestly with the kingly and prophetical—we have no more right to seek to connect the baptism and anointing with the priest's office than with the prophet's or the king's; hence, no right to press the washing and anointing of the Jewish high priest as a special type of his baptism and anointing. It is true that, although he was not made a priest after the order of Aaron, much in Aaron's priesthood was typical of his priesthood; but

that the washing and anointing of Aaron was typical of the baptism and anointing of Jesus, is an inference not sufficiently clear to build an argument on it in reference to baptism. Jesus never said that his baptism was to initiate him into his priestly office, but to "fulfil all righteousness." The Scriptures nowhere affirm that he was then and there anointed to be a priest, but that he was anointed "to preach the gospel to the poor," and to "go about doing good." There are some inferences and some coincidences which it may be interesting to trace, which, nevertheless, can never be made sufficiently strong to base an argument on in relation to an ordinance of God —especially when the literal facts are directly opposed to the inferential argument.

2. (1) Paul teaches that God glorified Jesus to be a high priest when he said to him, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee" (Heb. 5:5). This declaration Paul again teaches was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ (Acts 13:33). It was then that he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to his holy spiritual nature" (Rom. 1:4). Consequently he was not called of God to be a high priest until his resurrection. (2) Paul teaches that Jesus was *prepared* for his priesthood by the things that he suffered, and was not "made perfect" for his priestly work until these sufferings were completed (Heb. 5:7-10). (3) The anointing of Jesus to the priesthood is represented by Paul as subsequent to and consequent on the perfection of his earthly work. It was because he had shown, in his whole earthly mission, that he "loved righteousness and hated iniquity," that he was "justified by the Spirit" from all the charges made against him on earth; and "*therefore* God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows" (Heb. 1:8, 9). (4) Jesus was not

made a priest after the style of the Jewish priests, but by an oath (Heb. 7:20, 21). As a sacrificial victim, he suffered on earth, but as a priest he passed into the heavens and presented his offering (Heb. 9:9-14).

Job, Book of, Author of. I am in much trouble about the Book of Job. Permit me most respectfully to propound some questions for the "Querists' Drawer" in the STANDARD.

1. Is the Book of Job inspired?
2. Who was Job?
3. Under what dispensation did he live?
4. Who was the author of the book?
5. What was the general design of the book?

Now for my difficulty. According to the testimony of God himself, Job was a just and an upright man, a true friend and servant of God. In the first two chapters, God is represented as holding a perfectly friendly conference with Satan, the great adversary of God and man, in reference to Job, which results in God's agreeing to deliver up Job into the hands of the devil, to afflict, torture, and deprive him of everything but life. And all this for what? To show the devil that Job was faithful and true.

Was that just and right? Is that consistent with the character of God as given in other books of the Bible? It does not seem so to me. Please let us have your thoughtful conclusions, from the best lights you have on this mysterious book, and especially on this strange, apparently friendly, conversation between God and Satan, and its mysterious, and, to me, inconsistent, result.

I speak plainly, but with reverence. I think the whole thing inconsistent with the character of God, from my views of it. And unless you explain it to my satisfaction, and harmonize it, I must set it down as a fiction, and a very mischievous one. Praying the Lord to guide you into the truth of this matter, I wait for your reply. W.

1. This question must be answered with some modifications. If it is meant to ask whether everything written in this book is inspired, we answer emphatically, *No.* There are some things said by Job for which he is

sternly reproved—these can not be taken as inspired truth. His friends were also reproved with even greater sternness for many things they said. They were evidently mistaken alike in their affirmations and reasonings. But the writer may, for all that, have been inspired to state that they did say these false things, and in that sense the book may have full claim to inspiration. It is not a valid objection to the inspiration of the New Testament, that some of the devil's lies are recorded in it. The devil's lies were not divinely inspired, but the writer may have been divinely inspired to state what the devil's lies were.

2. We know no more about him personally than is recorded in the book. Conjectures are numerous, and many of them valuable; but the most plausible of them are but conjectures at best.

3. Most likely under the patriarchal dispensation, though some place him later. The fact that there are no allusions to Levitical observances in the book, and that its allusions are generally to primitive habits and manners, would locate the history in patriarchal times—though the book itself may not have been written until a later period. He was the priest of his family. His riches were reckoned by his flocks and herds. Writing is spoken of as by sculpture. All these things point to an early age.

4. That is not known, and it is hardly worth while to take space here even to state the various conjectures on this point. That it was accepted as a book of facts, and that Job was an historical personage, is proved by the references to him in both Old and New Testaments. See Ezek. 14: 14, 16, 18, 20; Jas. 5: 11.

5. The design of the book seems to us to be to discuss the great problem of the sufferings of the righteous and

the prosperities of the wicked; to show that the complications of our earth life are too great to be mastered by human reason; to inculcate the lesson that *faith* should, even in the extremest calamities, still cling to God, in the blessed trust that when "the end of the Lord" is seen, it will be found that in the discipline to which he subjects us, he is "very pitiful and of tender mercy." These are among the most important and valuable lessons that suffering mortals can learn.

Now as to our querist's difficulty. We call his attention, first of all, to this consideration: just such facts as entered into Job's life do enter into the lives of good men in numberless instances. Notwithstanding their goodness and fidelity to truth and to the God of truth, they are cast down from high places into the depths of disgrace and suffering, and are not only doomed, like Job, to suffer all imaginable wrongs for a time, but in many cases suffer all life long, and go out of the world without having their wrongs righted or their sufferings lifted away. There is no getting rid of the facts. A denial of the inspiration of this book will not alter the facts. Take the Bible away altogether, and the facts remain in all their power, equally forcible against the God of nature and of providence, as against the inspiration of the Book of Job. Witness John Stuart Mill's fearful arraignment of nature, or of the God of nature, supposing such a God to exist. It is absurd, then, to deny the inspiration of the Book of Job for the vivid truthfulness of its statement of facts just such as we see and know to be true in thousands of cases. It is scarcely less absurd to doubt the inspiration of the book on account of its implied solution of a mysterious problem; and no one is prepared rationally to say that this book does not, after all, point to its true solution.

What remains, then, as a source of objection, is the mere *costume*—the Oriental dress in which the truth is presented. But here there is room for a variety of discussions before so serious a conclusion as the rejection of the book as a mere fiction is adopted. Whether it is an epic or a dramatic poem, or a lyric, is one point to settle; and the settlement of this will affect our interpretation of that portion of it to which our querist objects. The great truth set forth is, *God's sovereignty over events,* and over all hostile intelligences; so that, while the latter are dealt with according to the demands of their rational nature, they can still go no further with their hostile work than God permits. In other words, that Satan is not omnipotent; and that while, for reasons too deep and high for us to grasp, he is allowed to carry on his rebellious purposes—a fact, by the way, of which we do not get rid by denying the Bible—God is still sovereign, and overrules all for his own ultimate purposes. This is the truth asserted. Now, whether this truth is set in a framework of allegory, or fable, or Oriental parable, while it may be an interesting question to discuss, is not one that affects the truth itself, or the inspiration that reveals it. To convey such a truth, in that early age, and in accommodation to the Oriental modes of thought and speech, required an indulgence in the anthropomorphic style vastly beyond what the Occidental mind and the developed purposes of God would make necessary to us here and now. It is not, therefore, a vital question, whether there was, literally, just such a conference as is described, or whether this dramatic style is employed to convey the truth of God's supreme sovereignty over the events of life and the forces of the spiritual world. Language has had mighty struggles, and has been compelled to resort to manifold artifices to

convey to the fettered and besotted minds of men—especially in ages and nations largely destitute of culture—even a glimpse of lofty and refined spiritual truth. Our querist might as rationally call a sage a simpleton for talking baby-talk to an infant, as to condemn the Scriptures for employing material imagery to convey spiritual truth.

But he imagines that Jehovah is represented as yielding to Satan's banter, merely to carry a point against Satan! This, we must be permitted to say, is a most unworthy interpretation of this Scripture. Let him consult the Scriptures already referred to, and along with these Rom. 15:4, and he will learn that all these old Scriptures, whether the design is distinctly announced or not, were meant to contain great lessons of instruction in truth and righteousness for all generations.

It is among our recollections of the readings of perhaps thirty years ago, that the skeptical Lord Byron, not long before his death, asked of a pious attendant whether he thought this description in the Book of Job, of the devil having a conference with Jehovah, was literal narrative. The simple-minded man of faith replied that he so considered it. Byron, after some minutes of serious thought, replied, "It gives me a much higher conception of Jehovah when I see him thus gently and patiently dealing with his adversary, yet triumphing over him with the ease of omnipotence, than if this sublime passage were all explained away as a mere fiction." It would be strange indeed if the very passage that compelled the admiration and approval of the sneering skeptic should shake the faith of the devout Christian!

Judging Between Members. If a person not a member of the church informs the elders of a congregation that a member has falsely accused him, and that to his professional injury,

and refers to his witnesses in the case, what should be the action of the elders? Should they not act on the ground that they have no right to proceed on the complaint of an outsider?

JOSEPH ALLEN.

If the complainant is entitled to respect as a man of veracity and of respectable standing in society, the complaint should be entertained. Due caution should of course be exercised, to guard against any unworthy opposition to the church, or to the accused as a member of it; but it would be strange indeed if church-members are to be allowed to sin against outsiders with impunity, on the ground that no man out of the church can prefer a charge against them! Slander is slander; and none the less so because perpetrated against one without the pale of the church. Moreover, it is necessary for the protection of the church-member, that he be protected against false charges, if the charge is unjustly made; and this can not be done without a fair hearing of the evidence which the complainant offers to produce. One of the apostolic admonitions is, that we are to "walk in wisdom towards them that are without." How are violations of this to be recognized if outsiders are not allowed to complain or to testify?

Judas, His Responsibility. The betrayal and crucifixion of Jesus were necessary to complete the plan of human redemption. Did Judas do right when he betrayed Christ?

Did Judas betray his Master "to complete the plan of human redemption"? If not, then he served the divine purpose without *intending* to do so, and his act must be judged in the light of the *motive* that prompted it.

Judgment, Standards of. You will greatly oblige me if you will answer the following questions, and give Scripture corroborating the answers:

1. Are all persons who have never confessed Christ under or amenable to the law given at Mount Sinai?

2. Will sinners be judged by the law or the gospel?

3. Is it possible, at the present time, for an individual to approach God through the Mosaic law?

1. No. If they live in lands where the gospel is not known, they are answerable to God according to the knowledge of truth and error, right and wrong, which they possess, and according to the dictates of their own moral nature—the law written in their hearts. See Rom. 2:14, 15. Much that is taught of righteousness in the law of Moses is known to those to whom that law, as such, was never addressed. Whether they derived it from tradition, or experience, or intuition, does not matter; they have it, and will be judged in the light of their knowledge and opportunities. This principle is involved in Luke 12:47, 48; John 9:41; 15:24.

2. Those who were under the law will be judged by the law, and those under the gospel by the gospel. See Rom. 2:6-16.

3. How far God may accept the service of those whose best light is the law of Moses, and who "ignorantly worship" him through the appointments of a law which has ceased to have divine authority, we do not know. But if it is meant that any *who possess the light of the gospel* may acceptably worship God while rejecting that light, there can be but one answer. Paul says there is "a day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, *according to my gospel*" (Rom. 2:16). Read the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially the ninth and tenth chapters.

Kingdom, Keys of. Can you give some explanation soon in regard to the "keys of the kingdom"?

The key was anciently a symbol of power or author-

ity. See Isa. 22:22. What this means is seen from the previous verse: "I will commit thy government into his hand." He was to be the grand master and principal officer of his prince's house. To give to Peter the keys of the kingdom was to invest him with special authority to open the kingdom to men, by making known, with divine authority, the terms of entrance into the kingdom. This office he performed on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:14-41), when he opened the kingdom to the Jews; and at the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:34-48), when he opened the same kingdom to the Gentiles. Probably the plural *keys* is used with reference to these two events—the opening to the Gentiles being as special and distinctive an act of authority as the first opening to the Jews; and to this Peter alludes in Acts 15:7-9.

Kingdom, Should We Pray for It to Come? "Thy kingdom come." It came many centuries ago, but it has not come into every heart. Why not use the Lord's Prayer and teach it to children in the family and Sunday-schools?

This prayer was given *for that time*. With proper explanations, it may be employed even now. But it does not fill up the Christian idea of prayer. The kingdom *has* come, and the mediation of Jesus, the Christ, not then known, and not taught in that prayer, calls for another form of utterance in our petitions. There are *lessons* in the Lord's Prayer which children should be taught; but it was not intended, even when it was given, *as a form* of prayer to be used by the disciples, and certainly ought not to be now turned from its original design. As teaching the fatherhood of God, pure spiritual aspirations, a supreme regard to spiritual interests, and the simplicity of speech that is pleasing to God, children should be taught that prayer; but always with instructions concerning the kingdom of God and the mediation

of the Lord Jesus, such as will save them from wrong ideas and impressions.

Kingdom, When Established. Will you be kind enough to give your ideas, supported by Scriptural proof necessary to establish, in answer to the following question: When was Christ's kingdom established on earth?

1. It was not established in John the Baptist's time. He only heralded it, and proclaimed it *near* (Matt. 3:2).

2. It was not established when Jesus began his ministry, nor when the twelve were sent out, nor when the seventy were sent out; for in all these instances the proclamation was that it was *near* (Mark 1:14, 15; Matt. 10:7; Luke 10:9).

3. It was not set up during the personal ministry of Jesus, for he taught his disciples that the authority of Moses was still in force (Matt. 23:1-3); and the command to *hear Him,* rather than the law and the prophets, which were represented by Moses and Elijah, was carefully concealed until after his resurrection from the dead (Matt. 17:9).

4. It was not until after his resurrection that Jesus claimed that "all power in heaven and in earth" was given unto him (Matt. 28:18). But, as he forbade the announcement of this until his apostles were endowed with power from on high (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-8), there could have been no proclamation of Jesus as King until the Holy Spirit came (Acts 2).

5. That the kingdom was actually in existence before the apostolic ministry closed, is evident from Col. 1:13; Heb. 12:28; Rev. 1:9. Sometime, therefore, between the ascension of Jesus and the close of apostolic labors, the kingdom was established.

6. The day of Pentecost succeeding his resurrection was clearly the time.

(1) They were then endowed with power from on high, and asserted the authority of Jesus as Lord and Christ.

(2) Then the first law ever issued "in the name of Jesus Christ" was published (Acts 2:38).

(3) Then the first subjects of his kingly authority were enrolled, and the first church of Christ was planted.

(4) Then the apostles sat on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28).

(5) Then "the law went forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Isa. 2:1-5; Mic. 4:1, 2).

(6) Then "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" were bestowed on the saved (Rom. 14:17).

There are some texts that seem to lead to another conclusion, such as Matt. 11:12; but these are easily harmonized with all the texts we have quoted, if it is kept in mind that these texts simply assert the *preaching* of the kingdom: "Since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and all men press into it"—*i. e.*, by believing the proclamation that it was near, and by accepting its principles as Christ unfolded them. But, although the kingdom was *proclaimed*, it was not *established*, and could not be until the authority of Moses passed away, and Christ was exalted to the throne after his resurrection (Acts 2:30-33).

Kiss, The Holy. Ought the disciples to practice the holy kiss and anoint with oil?

If they practice kissing at all, it ought to be the *holy* kiss. But, as the New Testament fixes no time or place, and tells not how often or under what circumstances this is to be done, only that when kissing is proper it should be observed in holiness, we conclude that the proper

time and place are left to be decided by the Christian's sense of the fitness of things. Such an occasion as that mentioned in Acts 20: 37—when loved friends are about to separate to meet no more on earth—would be every way suitable. But there are no intimations in the New Testament that it was observed as a church ordinance.

Law, The, Fulfilled in Christ. Did not Christ come, not to destroy, but to fulfill? I take it he meant the law of ceremonies, and not the moral. The passage from our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, with its context, is a sufficiently explicit enforcement of the moral law. When he says the Sabbath was made for man, does he not refer to its original institution? Mr. Watson says, "It is at least more than inference that the change was made under the sanction of inspired men." If this is the case, what is the authority?

1. The disciples "continued in the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2: 42). Under apostolic guidance they assembled on the first day of the week (Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2).

2. The distinction of moral and ceremonial is a human distinction, convenient enough for some purposes, but often calculated to mislead. The ten commandments are not all moral, and many of what are called ceremonial laws had a moral element. The whole system, *as resting on the authority of Moses,* passed away, Sabbaths with the rest (Col. 2: 14-17)

3. Christ fulfilled the law as he fulfilled the prophets. "Think not I am come to destroy the law *or* the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." He fulfilled by realizing all that they proposed or promised; and this was as true of the typical import of the Sabbath as of the prophecies concerning him. When fulfilled, their end was accomplished.

4. Unquestionably he refers to the original institution of the Sabbath; but when was it originally instituted? It is not clear that he refers to the record in the Book

of Genesis. But no difference as to that. Circumcision was made for man, and the passover was made for man, and all divine appointments were made for man. Do they all therefore continue?

5. Mr. Watson is mistaken. The Sabbath was not changed. The Sabbath passed away with the economy of which it formed a part. The Lord's Day is not a substitute for the Sabbath, but grows out of other considerations altogether.

Law, The, Is It Still in Force? Please explain Matt. 5: 17-20. Did Jesus mean the law of the ten commandments? Are they fulfilled? How and when, if fulfilled, or are they still in force? The Sabbath question does perplex me so.

The examples immediately cited are from what is generally termed the *moral* law. Certain it is, therefore, that this is included in what Jesus says he came to fulfill, not to destroy. But this fulfillment was not simply obeying its precepts—it was *fulfilling its design*. Consult Gal. 3: 19-29 for the design of the law. Christ fulfilled it by bringing that righteousness which the law had demonstrated could not be obtained by works, and making it accessible to the believer. It was a pedagogue to lead men to Christ; and when Christ came its object was fulfilled.

But the Scriptures do not make that distinction of moral, judicial and ceremonial which we make. When they speak of the law, they speak of it as a whole—the revelation of God's will made to the Jews for the regulation of their conduct. When Jesus says, "the law or the prophets," he evidently refers by the term *law* to the five books of Moses, which contained all that by divine authority was enjoined upon them as a rule of life; just as by the term *prophets* he includes all the interpretations and enforcements of that law made by the vari-

ous prophets God had commissioned. All this had failed to confer righteousness on them; and what the law could not do, though it continually pointed to it, and demonstrated the necessity of it, Jesus now accomplished through his mission, and thus fulfilled the law and the prophets.

If the querist's object was to ascertain whether the text has any bearing on the question of the continued authority of the law, we answer, that it no more proves the continued authority of the law than the continued authority of the prophets. Both law and prophets ceased to be authority when they were fulfilled. Their object is attained. See Luke 16: 16.

The law, as a whole, was taken out of the way by Christ. See Eph. 2: 15; Col. 2: 14. We are aware that many are misled by the word *ordinances* in these texts, and think it limits the meaning to the ceremonial law. But it was not merely the ceremonial law that was against us, but the whole law. Besides, the word translated *ordinance* is *dogmasin,* decrees. It relates to all that was *decreed,* and the point is that a law of dogmatic or decretory commandments had failed to give life—had only brought a curse—and was now nailed to the cross by Him who became a curse for us, and thus taken out of the way. No one, therefore, has a right to judge us by the law concerning Sabbath days any more than concerning meats and drinks.

If any one wishes more proof that the ten commandments, as belonging to the law, were abolished, let him read Deut. 4: 13, and he will find that these constituted the *covenant* that God made with the Jews when he led them out of the land of Egypt, and by consulting Heb. 8: 6-13 he will learn that that covenant has been superseded by a new and better one.

Moral principles are eternal—they were before the law, and are since the law; but, as part of that system given by Moses, they have no longer authority. The Sabbath was not moral; there is nothing moral in resting on the *seventh* day, more than on any other day. As it does not belong to the sphere of eternal moral principles, it has ceased with the authority which gave it birth.

Law, Is It Supreme? 1. Does God govern everything, both in the physical world and in our relations to him, by *law only?*

2. If our relations to God are governed by *law only,* and no special providence, what need of prayer?

1. Not by *physical* law only. The spiritual universe has its spiritual laws, and it may be, for aught we know, that it is governed as rigidly by law as is the physical universe—but by law adapted to spiritual natures.

2. If there is no special providence, we see no propriety in praying for special blessings. But there may be answers to prayer through the operations of established laws. This might be much clearer to us if we knew more of the laws governing the spiritual universe. But we know that man can answer the prayers of his fellow-men and exercise a special providence over those commended to his care, without violating a single natural law. It would be strange indeed if man can do this, and God himself be unable to do it.

Life and Death. Please answer through your excellent paper the following questions:

1. What is life, and how many kinds are there in the universe?

2. What is death and how many kinds are there?

3. Was Jesus Christ mortal or immortal?

4. Is the soul or spirit as it exists in the body on the earth, mortal or immortal?

1. We know of vegetable, animal, intellectual and

spiritual life; whether there are any other kinds in the universe or not, we can not tell. Life is difficult of definition. Webster defines it "that state of an animal or plant in which its organs are capable of performing their functions;" but life, in a spiritual sense, is not covered by such a definition; it carries with it the idea of the experience of enjoyment in the exercise of the powers that God has given us. It is not mere existence.

2. Death is the opposite of life. Whatever inheres in life, no difference what the sense we attach to the term, death is the loss of all that. Hence, a person may be alive in one sense and dead in another (1 Tim. 5:6). A person may be in the full possession of animal life, and yet be "dead in trespasses and in sins." A person may *exist,* and yet be dead to all enjoyment of the presence of God, being "punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power."

3. He had a mortal body, and was therefore subject to death like other mortals.

4. It depends on what you mean by immortal. If you mean merely perpetual existence, then certainly, "as it exists in the body on the earth," the soul is not mortal. See Matt. 10:28.

Lord's Day and Labor. The subject is being agitated in our Lord's Day school in regard to physical labor on Lord's Day. Is it a sin to work on the first day of the week? If not, it should not be taught in our schools.

The New Testament furnishes no *law* on the subject. A religion meant for all the world must deal sparingly in statutory enactments. Many of the early converts were slaves whose time was not at their own disposal, and there was no public sentiment then, as now, in favor of the observance of the first day of the week. Had there

been a law given in the New Testament, it must have been oftener broken than kept. But those who hence argue that they have a right to give up the first day of the week to labor, since they violate no positive law, are merely Judaizers in principle, and strangers to the genius and spirit of Christianity. For—

1. The institution of the day of rest—one in seven—by divine authority, clearly indicates what the best scientific testimony of the present day fully substantiates, that there is *need* of such rest from labor. It is no loss, but gain, in the long run, so far as health and prosperity are concerned. The fact that that law concerning the seventh day is no longer in force, does not interfere with the fact that one day in seven is needed for rest.

2. The apostles taught the first Christians to assemble for worship (Heb. 10:25). While they had meetings as often as opportunity allowed—often daily—their regular stated meetings for breaking bread, teaching, exhortation, praise, prayer, benevolent offerings, etc., were on the first day of the week, under apostolic guidance (Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:2, 18-20, 33; 16:1, 2).

3. There was, in the apostolic churches, not only a Lord's table and a Lord's supper, but a Lord's day (Rev. 1:10). All the facts mentioned point to the first day of the week as this day, and such is the voice of early tradition.

4. Our spiritual welfare demands such a day of release from worldly cares and toils, that we may acquaint ourselves with God through his word and ordinances.

5. The salvation of the world demands such an opportunity as this day affords for the preachinng of the gospel and the exhibition of the means of grace.

6. If the Scriptures gave no hint on the subject of a particular day, we would still be under obligation to keep

it. For they require us not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together; and if they have not fixed the day, they have left it to Christians to fix it for themselves; and in such case we must be subject one to another. The first day of the week has been fixed as that day by general consent, and we are under obligations to the brotherhood not to walk disorderly by turning the day to other uses.

In every point of view the religious observance of the day is desirable, profitable and necessary; and to pervert it to other uses is neither lovely nor of good report (Phil. 4:8).

Lord's Day in History. If not too much trouble, please give through STANDARD columns, testimony of "the fathers" down to 250 A. D., in regard to the observance of the first day of the week or Lord's Day.

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 101, speaks of the Lord's Day familiarly, without explanations, as if everybody understood it: "Let us [Christians] no more sabbatize, but let us keep the Lord's Day. Let every one that loves Christ keep holy the Lord's Day, the queen of days, the resurrection day, the highest of all days."

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch about A. D. 162, says: "Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the Lord's Day, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead."

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, A. D. 167, says: "On the Lord's Day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God."

Dionysius, in writing to the Romans, A. D. 170, says: "We celebrate the Lord's Day;" and he informed them the epistles of Clement, their late bishop, were read in

the church at Corinth, "while they were keeping the Lord's Day holy."

Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 192, says: "A Christian, according to the command of the gospel, observes the Lord's Day, thereby glorifying the resurrection of the Lord."

Tertullian, about the same time, says: "The Lord's Day is the holy day of the Christian church." "We have nothing to do with the [Jewish] Sabbath." "The Lord's Day is the Christian's solemnity."

From all these sources it can be certainly learned what *day* is referred to by Pliny the younger (A. D. 107), when he wrote to the Emperor Trajan concerning the Christians, that they "were accustomed *on a stated day* to meet before daylight, to repeat hymns to Christ as to a God," etc.

Justin Martyr, in his "Apology for the Christians," addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, A. D. 147, says that "on the day called [by the Romans] Sunday, there is a meeting in one place of all the Christians that live either in the towns or in the country;" and he goes on to describe the order of their worship. He mentions several reasons why they selected that day of the week for public worship. One of them is, that it was the day on which Jesus came from the dead.

Eusebius (third century), in his "Commentary on the Psalms," says: "By this is prophetically signified the service which is performed very early, and every morning of the resurrection day throughout the whole world." "The Word (Christ) by the new covenant translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the true rest; viz.: the saving Lord's Day: the first (day) of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained

the victory over death, and passed the portals of heaven, having achieved a work superior to the six days' creation."

Theodoret, speaking of the Ebionites, says: "They keep the Sabbath according to the Jewish law, and sanctify *the Lord's Day* in like manner as we do." "This," says Professor Stuart, "gives a good historical view of the state of things in the early ages of the church. The zealots for the law wished the Jewish Sabbath to be observed as well as the Lord's Day; for about the latter there appears never to have been any question among any class of Christians, so far as I have been able to discover."

Lord's Table, Who May Partake? You will please give us the Scriptural teaching on the qualifications of an individual to partake of t' e Lord's table acceptably with him. Whether those qualifications be of a legal or moral character. In 1 Cor. 5 and 1 Cor. 11 you will find the Scripture. 1 Cor. 5: 11-13 teaches us, it seems, that we must not eat with a certain class of individuals. 1 Cor. 11: 31, to the last verse, intimates the same.

The qualifications for partaking acceptably of the Lord's Supper are precisely the qualifications for participating acceptably in any other part of Christian worship. The idea that a man can not partake of the Lord's Supper, and yet can pray acceptably, sing acceptably, or do any other act acceptably, unless it be to repent of his sins and turn away from them, is unauthorized in the New Testament. The Lord's Supper is a part of the worship of the Lord's house. It is the Lord's table, in the Lord's house, on the Lord's Day, for the Lord's people. Singing, praying, and all else that belongs to the worship, are on the same footing. The worship belongs to those who have been made "kings and priests unto God;" and if they have unfitted themselves, by sins

unrepented of, for approach to the Lord's table, they are equally unfitted to minister at the altar in offering sacrifices of praise and prayer, or any other sacrifices that God is pleased to accept from his people. It is not a question, therefore, about fitness to observe a single ordinance, but about fitness to participate in the service of the Lord's house. Fitness for this requires (1) that they belong to God's family; (2) that they live a life of obedience—confessing and forsaking their sins whenever they are tempted into sin. Though they may have accepted of Christ, if, afterward, they turn away from his commandments and walk disorderly, they shut themselves out from all possibility of acceptable worship until they repent of their sinful ways. It may not be possible for the church always to take cognizance of their sinful ways and to exclude them from the worship. This can not be done until their sinful ways are made manifest. But they are none the less excluded from *acceptable* worship by their own wickedness and impenitence.

We do not regard the reference in 1 Cor. 5: 11-13 as being to the Lord's Supper; but that they were to ostracize, socially, those of the character described—not even inviting them to their homes and tables. The verses referred to in the eleventh chapter relate to the perversion of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian church—turning it into a carousal, or making it an occasion of party feasting, and not a remembrance of the Lord's death.

We can see no propriety in fencing the Lord's table, treating all other parts of the worship as less sacred.

Love-feasts. Please give a full statement of the *agapai* or love-feasts of the early church. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible gives but a meager account.

And any *Bible* dictionary must necessarily give a

meager account of them, for there is little in the New Testament in reference to love-feasts. In Jude 12 we read: "These are spots [rather, hidden rocks (*spilades*) —rocks hidden beneath the surface, on which these love-feasts were likely to be wrecked] in your feasts of charity" (*agapais*). There is a very evident allusion to the same thing in 2 Pet. 2:13. Beyond this, we have nothing in the New Testament concerning them. But they are connected with the apostolic age by very early tradition. Chrysostom, as quoted by Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," says:

"The first Christians had all things in common, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles; and when that ceased, as it did in the apostles' time, this came in its room, as an efflux or imitation of it. For though the rich did not make all their substance common, yet, upon certain days appointed, they made a common table, and when their service was ended, and they had all communicated in the holy mysteries, they all met at a common feast; the rich bringing provisions, and the poor and those who had nothing being invited, they all feasted in common together."

In another place he says:

"From this law and custom (of having all things common) there arose then another admirable custom in the churches. For when all the faithful met together and had heard the sermon and prayers, and received the communion, they did not immediately return home upon the breaking up of the assembly, but the rich and wealthy brought meat and food from their own houses, and called the poor, and made a common table, a common dinner, a common banquet in the church. And so, from this fellowship in eating, and the reverence of the place, they were all strictly united in charity one with another, and

much pleasure and profit arose thence to them all; for the poor were comforted, and the rich reaped the fruits of their benevolence, both from those whom they fed and from God."

Bingham quotes Theodoret, Ecumenius and Theophylact as giving similar comments on the passage in Jude.

It is certain that in the beginning of the second century, according to Pliny's testimony, the Christians were in the habit of partaking not only of the Lord's Supper, but of a separate entertainment, which was innocent and common to all.

They were much slandered by their enemies on account of this love-feast, and this led Tertullian into an eloquent vindication of his brethren:

"Our supper, which you accuse of luxury, shows its reason in its very name; for it is called *agape,* which signifies love among the Greeks. Whatever charge we are at, it is gain to be at expense on account of piety. For we therewith relieve and refresh the poor. There is nothing vile or immodest committed in it. For we do not sit down before we have first offered prayer to God; we eat only to satisfy hunger, and drink only so much as becomes modest persons. We fill ourselves in such manner as that we remember still that we are to worship God by night. We discourse as in the presence of God, knowing that he hears us. Then, after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing some hymn to God, either out of Scripture, or, as he is able, of his own composing; and by this we jûdge whether he has observed the rules of temperance in drinking. Prayer again concludes our feast; and thence we depart, not to fight and quarrel, not to run about and abuse all we meet, not to give ourselves up to lascivious

pastime, but to pursue the same careful modesty and chastity as men that have fed at a supper of philosophy and discipline, rather than a corporeal feast."

These feasts, however, became occasions of evil, and many abuses were committed in them by that class of men described by Jude as hidden rocks. The Council of Laodicea made a law against having them in the church, on account of these abuses; as did also the third Council of Carthage. It was only gradually that they were done away.

It is evident, from Jude and Peter, that such feasts were common in the apostolic churches; and we see no reason to doubt that the statements made by Chrysostom and others are in the main correct.

Love of the Brethren. In 1 John 3:14, I read: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren," etc.

If John referred to his love of the brethren as an evidence, or *the* evidence of his pardon, how say some, "there is no truth in the feeling;" and others, that the only *reliable* evidence which any man can have of his having "passed from death unto life," is the promise of God, based upon obedience to his commands?

It is easy to confound things which, though closely related, are yet quite distinct. John is not treating here of the *conditions* of forgiveness, nor of the *evidence* of forgiveness, but of the *characteristics of Christian life.* It is not a question of how they became Christians, but, rather, of their present spiritual standing. False ideas of Christian life and character had been introduced by the Gnostics, and these John combats, and in opposition sets forth the true tests of Christian character. To show how we become sons of God is quite different from showing the marks by which a son is afterwards to be known.

It is wrong to say "there is no truth in the feelings;" but it is correct to say that mere feeling—which may be generated for the time by unauthorized and extraneous influences—can not be a trustworthy evidence of our standing in the sight of God. It is also wrong to regard the love of the brethren, here spoken of, as a mere emotion. On the contrary, it was a principle which revealed itself in a steady devotion to the good of the brethren, even to the laying down of life for their sake. It is, therefore, proper to say, even in regard to this evidence, that the "only trustworthy evidence that we have passed from death to life is the promise of God, based on obedience to his commands;" for if we do not obey his command to love one another, how do we know that we have passed from death unto life?

The evidence of our pardon is the divine assurance, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Our own conscious integrity in believing and obeying enables us to appropriate the promise as our own. But this does not settle the question of our continued standing in the family of God. To know from day to day, and from year to year, how we stand, it is not sufficient to refer back to our faith and baptism. We must apply present tests. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (1 John 5:1). "Every one that loveth is born of God" (4:1). "He that doeth not righteousness is not of God" (3:10). We know we have passed over out of death into life, "because we love the brethren" (3:14). All these are *present* tests of our standing as Christians, not the original terms of salvation.

Mammon, Use of. I wrote you a letter some time ago, asking you to explain, through the STANDARD, what was meant in the sixteenth chapter and ninth verse of the Book of St. Luke—"Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness."

Very likely. And probably from fifty to one hundred queries that have come in since lie on top of it. As soon as we can get time, we mean to give an entire supplement to the answering of important queries for which we have no room in this column.

The rendering in the new version is, "Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles." Mammon, in the New Testament, is used for riches, and especially with reference to riches as the god of the heart. Riches are spoken of as the "mammon of unrighteousness," because so generally acquired in an unrighteous manner, and used for unrighteous purposes—as in the case of the unjust steward; riches are here personified, and, as Bro. Lamar well says, in his notes on Luke, "By a lively figure the qualities that characterize its *use* are transformed to the *thing itself*." It is not meant that *we* are to gain riches by unrighteousness, or spend them unrighteously.

"Making friends by means of riches" is so to use our wealth as to do good to others, and thus win them to Christ, or bless them in Christ. See Matt. 25: 34-40; 1 Tim. 6: 17-19.

Then, when these riches fail, we shall be received, not as the unjust steward was by the friends he made, into a temporary home; but into the "eternal tabernacles" of the righteous.

In other words, if we would *lay up* treasure in heaven, and be secure of eternal life, we must *lay out* treasures here in doing good to the bodies and souls of men.

It is not the *unrighteousness* of the steward that is commended, but his prudence and foresight—called "wisdom" in the parable.

Marriage, Divine. 1. Is marriage, as a divine institution, a spiritual (or mental) or physical union, or are both necessary to it?

2. Is the performance of the marriage ceremony necessary to Scriptural marriage, further than being a fulfillment of the Scriptural requirement to obey the laws of the land?

3. If Scriptural marriage is a spiritual or mental union, are engaged couples at liberty to sever their engagement for other reasons than would justify married people severing their relation? and are persons who have been engaged, and whose engagements have been broken for other than such reasons, at liberty, as Christians, to make new engagements and enter into the marriage relation with other parties?

1. The ideal Christian marriage, as described by Paul (Eph. 5:22-33), is a spiritual as well as physical union. But, for the well-being of society, marriage upon a fleshly basis, when spiritual aims can hardly be said to be in view, is regarded as advisable (1 Cor. 7:7-9).

2. The Scriptures prescribe no particular marriage ceremony, but constantly assume and imply some definite and settled form of marriage. Betrothal and marriage are not, in the Scriptures, the same thing. We can not say that this was solely out of regard to the civil law.

3. Betrothal, in the light of Scriptural teaching, was binding as an engagement to fulfill, at some future time, the marriage contract, and was not to be broken, unless for grave reasons. But it is to be observed that, in ancient times and in Oriental countries, marriages were arranged by parents, and children had little to say beyond acquiescing in the choice made for them. It is different now, especially in this country. The right of every person to choose for himself or herself a life companion, is generally recognized, and no one is supposed to be bound to enter into such a relationship when, for

any reason, it is repulsive to them. Reasons may have force in preventing marriage which would not be sufficient to sever the relation when once formed. For instance, a Christian, in apostolic times, would have been justified in refusing to marry a heathen, upon discovery of the fact that he was a heathen; and all Christians were warned against forming such alliances. But where a heathen and Christian were found united in marriage, the Christian was taught not to sever or disturb the marriage relation on that account. A marriage engagement ought not to be lightly made, and, when made, ought not to be lightly broken. The civil law recognizes a breach of promise as an offense to be punished by the judges. Yet we think there may sometimes be reasons that would justify the parties in dissolving an engagement that would not justify them in dissolving the marriage relation. The discovery of unworthy motives, or of traits of character that would certainly interfere with mutual respect and love, the knowledge of hereditary disease that must necessarily entail a curse upon posterity, or the actual loss of confidence and affection, from whatever cause, ought to lead to a withdrawal from an engagement before it is consummated in marriage; but they would not warrant the severance of the marriage tie. Indeed, the marriage ceremony is that which seals the engagement and fixes the relation of the parties for life. Engagements are formed in view of this fact, and in thousands of cases would not be so readily formed were it not understood that there is an opportunity to recede from it for good reasons. It would not do, therefore, to refuse to allow the parties an opportunity to enter into new engagements, with the present prevalent understanding in regard to engagements as liable at any time before marriage to be broken if there is found good

reason for it. At the same time, we think there is need to educate the public mind to better ideas of the binding nature of engagements, and especially of engagements to marry, so that they may be more cautiously entered into and more sacredly observed.

Marriage Relations. Two young persons were married, both members of the church. After they were married awhile, he thinking he could better himself pecuniarily, located at a place some distance from her parents. They were dissatisfied and wrote to her to come home and leave him. Finally they wrote her that her mother was sick, and if she would see her she must come at once. He sent her immediately; that has now been nearly seven years, and she has never returned. For a good while he wrote to her and sent her money, and when she did not come to him, he went to see her; but she refused to go with or to tell him her reason for not going. Since that time he has gone to see her and done all in his power to have the trouble settled, and has failed. She has never charged him with anything wrong, and all who knew them while they lived together will testify that he treated her kindly and provided well for her. Now the question: Is he obliged to go through the world alone, or would he sin if he obtained a legal separation and married some one that would live with him? Please give your views of the Scriptures bearing on this subject. A. O. D.

That the wife is wrong in this case, can not be doubted. She refuses obedience to her husband, and refuses to perform her marriage vows. She is, in the strongest sense, a covenant-breaker, and the church should deal with her as such, and also with those who persuade her to that course of action, and thus become participants in her sin.

But now as to the husband. He can "let her depart" (1 Cor. 7: 15). He is not "under bondage" in such a case. He is not bound to continue his suit to her, nor to support her; and there may be good reasons why he should obtain a legal separation and cut her off from

all claim on him or his estate. But is he at liberty to marry again? We think not. See Matt. 5:32; Mark 10:11, 12; Luke 16:18. The man who puts away his wife saving for the cause of fornication, "causeth her to commit adultery" by entering into a new and unlawful marriage connection. This is not less true of the woman who puts away her husband. There may be good reasons for *separation,* which still are not good reasons for marrying again.

This may seem hard in such a case as we are now considering. So is it hard if a wife proves to be insane, or is crippled for life. But they are hardships which must be endured for the sake of righteousness. The marriage bonds must be maintained inviolate, or the purity and permanency of society are at an end.

Marriage with Unbelievers. 1. Is it contrary to the teaching of God's word for a Christian to marry one who is not a member of the church?

2. If a minister believes it to be contrary to the Word, does he not sin in performing the ceremony?

As it related to the idolatrous heathen, there is no doubt that the apostles discountenanced intermarriages with them. The warning against yoking with unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14-18), while it is not necessarily confined to marriage, evidently includes this; and it is still as binding as ever. But that the term "unbelievers," as used here, includes all now out of the church, is not so clear. There are those who are morally, and also in their religious convictions and sympathies, so far Christian as to put it in doubt whether they are to be classed with the idolatrous heathen of whom Paul speaks. The direction to widows (1 Cor. 7:29) to marry "only in the Lord," carries with it a strong implication that all Christians

should seek such companionship among Christians, and not outside.

"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." "He that doubteth is condemned" if he perform the doubtful act.

Masonry and Christians. 1. Are Christians to be encouraged or discouraged in joining the Masons or other secret societies? or is it simply a matter of indifference, to which no notice is to be paid by the church?

2. Having joined the Masons and taken the obligation to secrecy, has a Christian a right to renounce the institution and divulge the secrets?

3. If a minister of the gospel does divulge the secrets he has promised to keep, is he not to be considered an unworthy person, unfit for the ministry or to be trusted in anything?

4. If a majority of the church continue to retain such minister contrary to the wishes of a respectable few, are the *few* who object under any obligation to help support one in whom they have no longer any confidence?

5. What, if anything, was the testimony of A. Campbell upon the subject of Masonry in the church?

1. In our judgment, they should be discouraged from joining secret societies, for the following reasons:

(1) So far as such societies have religious, moral or benevolent ends in view, there can be nothing commendable in them to which a Christian is not already pledged, or which may not be accomplished through Christian channels without oaths binding to secrecy.

(2) So far as any of these ends are not Christian, or capable of being wrought out through Christian channels, a Christian should not be identified with them. For instance, worship that is merely deistic, recognizing no Christ—worship in which a Jew or a Turk could join—is not Christian, and we know not how any Christian can share in it who has learned at the feet of the great Teacher, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me;" or from the pen of an apostle, "Whatever ye do, in word

or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks unto God the Father by him." This leads us to remark that it is to us a puzzle how any Christian or Christian minister can conscientiously act as the representative and mouthpiece of any society in offering purely deistical prayers, or in presenting as an acceptable sacrifice to God the merely formal worship of those who make no profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. We can see how he might pray for them, but we do not see how he justifies himself to his own conscience in praying as *their representative.*

(3) There remains no reason for a Christian entering into such associations, unless of a purely *selfish* character—that he may protect himself or his family from distress and want. We do not say that the object is wholly unworthy; but it appears to us that it is not up to the Christian standard to seek it through such associations. Faith in God and faith in God's people should lead to a different result.

(4) It is, putting it in its most favorable light, a matter of serious doubt whether a Christian is to be justified in entering blindfolded into any association, assuming obligations of the nature and extent of which he knows nothing, and swearing to observe secrecy concerning he knows not what. When we say *blindfolded,* we do not refer to a bandage over the eyes—that would be a small matter—but to a bandage over the *mind.* For ourself, we could not conscientiously take such an oath. We know of nothing in the way of moral obligation on which to base our consent to bind ourself to be faithful to a secret order of whose nature and performances we are permitted to know nothing, and to take an oath to hold forever secret what we may afterwards learn, be it good or evil. Granting that, after taking the oath, noth-

ing is found but what is innocent and praiseworthy, that will not alter the moral character of the oath; for, when it was taken, the swearer did not, and could not, know that such would be the result.

(5) The time and money spent in such associations is time and money that the church has need of. It drains the church of her resources. It drains the church likewise, in very many cases, of the *sympathy* to which she is entitled. The heart is divided. In numerous cases the lodge has the warmest place in the heart. The mighty warfare the church is called to wage calls for supreme devotion on the part of her members—an enthusiasm and whole-heartedness which is not apt to be realized when her membership is enlisted in the support of secret societies.

2. This is a very grave and difficult question. So far as renouncing such associations is concerned, there can, we think, be no question of the right of any one to renounce them whenever he becomes convinced that they are unprofitable or injurious to him. But as to divulging secrets that he has sworn to keep, that is another matter. If he becomes convinced that he did wrong to take the oath, he ought to repent and reform; but that involves nothing more than to guard against repeating the wrong. "Go and sin no more." In one case, we can see it to be clearly right to disregard such an oath. If one was led to swear *under false representations* of what the oath involved, and finds afterwards that he has been deceived, such deception renders the oath null and void. No man can be bound by that which was imposed on him by falsehood. If he finds that he was not only deceived, but that his oath, contrary to its spirit and to his own honest and expressed purposes, binds him to secrecy concerning wicked purposes or wicked deeds, involving in-

jury to others, or to society at large, then clearly the oath is not binding. If on one side stands an oath obtained under false pretenses, and on the other side wrongs and crimes which can only be revealed by disregarding such an oath, we do not see that there is room for more than one opinion as to duty. To illustrate: It is evident that in Germany, and perhaps throughout Europe, there is a secret order whose members are bound, when it falls to them by lot, to assassinate some one who is an object of the vengeance of that order. It comes to light that the recent attempt on the life of the Emperor of Germany was the result of such a decision on the part of a secret society. Does any one doubt the propriety—nay, the imperative duty—of any member of that society to break his oath, and reveal the criminal purpose of the society?

3. No—unless without just cause, and, in defiance of moral obligations, he has made the revelation. If he has acted from a sense of duty, even though it be a mistaken sense of duty, it may impeach his wisdom, but not his integrity.

4. It ought not to come up in that form. The mere fact of the small minority *disliking* him ought not to be a ground of refusal on their part to assist in fulfilling the obligations which the church, as a church, has assumed. If their refusal is based on the consideration that the preacher is not a man of truth, then they should present a specific charge against him and prove it. If they are not prepared to accept this responsibility, they should quietly acquiesce in the action of the church, and not allow their unfavorable *opinion* on that point to disturb the peace or prosperity of the church.

5. A. Campbell was decidedly opposed to Christians entering into such associations. He wrote with much

emphasis on this point. We have not lately read him on that subject, and have not time just now to refer to his essays. But, as a specimen, we give the following from the *Millennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 30, in reply to A. Broaddus:

"I thank you for your very full and unambiguous testimony against Christians becoming members of secret societies, and against their holding habitual converse and communion, *under oaths of secrecy or other religious formulas,* with Turk, Jew and atheist, because of the aids likely to accrue to themselves or their fraternity in times of worldly destitution—motives as worldly and selfish as insurance policies or any worldly copartnery or league offensive or defensive formed against a common foe."

Let us say, in conclusion, that we imply nothing, because we know nothing of an immoral character against Masonry, or other popular secret associations in our country. Among our personal friends we number many gentlemen of high moral worth who are members of such societies, and we do not believe they would remain where they are, did it involve consent to, or approval of, any violation of purity or of justice. We do not, therefore, discuss the question on this ground. Granting that such associations obligate their members to nothing immoral, we still object to Christians entering into them, for the reasons we have stated. Especially if such membership is likely to prove a source of vexation and trouble to the church, loyalty to Christ should decide them to give the church the benefits of peace by a concentration of their influence and means in her favor. Better that secret societies should be abandoned than that the church of God should be involved in strife. On the other hand, it is evident to us that many Christians

have entered into secret associations without the least idea of disloyalty to Christ; and if there is error in it, it it must be overcome by a calm discussion of Christian duties and obligations, and not by ecclesiastical action.

We are aware that, in thus answering the questions sent to us, we are opening the way to be deluged with communications on the subject. We therefore remind our readers of our rule not to allow discussions over answers in the "Querists' Drawer" unless there is a special reason for it. This subject has already been introduced into our columns. We have yet two or three short communications, on different sides, which we expect to publish. After that we propose to limit discussions in this way: Let the question be, as our querist puts it: "Are Christians to be encouraged to join the Masons or other secret societies, or to be dissuaded from it? Or is it simply a matter of indifference?" If any competent person will write four essays of two columns each in favor of encouraging Christians to enter such associations, and another an equal number of essays in opposition to it, making them courteous and dignified in expression and Christian in spirit, and putting forth their strongest arguments and evidences, we will publish them, and let our readers form their own conclusions therefrom.

Q. **Melchizedek.** In Heb. 7:1 we read of Melchizedek, king of Salem; in verse 3 we read "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life," etc.; and in verse 17 it says that Christ is a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek. The questions are:

1. Who was Melchizedek?
2. Why was he alluded to?
3. To what order had the author of the text reference?

1. The two immutable things are the *promise* and

the *oath* of God. He first promised (Gen. 12:2, 3); he afterwards swore to it (Gen. 22:16-18).

2. All we know of Melchizedek is that he lived in Abraham's time, and was king of Salem and priest of the most high God, and met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him—thus evincing that he was Abraham's superior. What is said of him by Paul must be regarded as referring to his *offices* and his *character*.

(1) He was greater than Abraham, and therefore greater than the priests that sprang from Abraham, and a better type of Christ.

(2) His kingly and priestly offices did not depend on ancestry, but on his own personal excellence. He was king of *righteousness* and *peace*. He had no father and mother in a priestly line to whom he was indebted for his honors, but won them by the force of his own character. The Jewish priests were made after the law of a carnal commandment.

(3) He had no beginning of days in his priesthood, nor end of life, as had the Levites in the service of the sanctuary—who could not officiate until they were of a certain age (Num. 4:3 and parallel passages). It was a service that depended on *physical strength* more than on *moral excellence*. A priesthood of which we see neither the beginning nor the ending is a better type of the perpetual priesthood of Jesus than was furnished by the priests under the law.

To be a priest after the *order* of Melchizedek was to be a priest of like character—not a fleshly order, like the Levitical priests, but a spiritual order—priest and king in view of righteousness, and not in view of fleshly descent.

Methodists. Please state in your valuable paper the difference between the Methodists and the disciples, in their different points of doctrine.

It would be difficult to state clearly, within such limits as belong to this department, all the points of difference. In a general way, it may be said that the differences are these:

(1) In name.

(2) In position—the Methodists claiming simply to be one of numerous branches of the church of Christ, or one of numerous Christian sects; the disciples denying that these sects are branches of the true church, and insisting that sects should be abandoned and a return be made to the oneness of the church of God in apostolic times.

(3) In ideas and methods of conversion—the Methodists regarding conversion as the work of the Spirit by an immediate operation; the disciples teaching that it is accomplished *mediately* through the truth.

(4) In regard to the evidence of pardon—the Methodists holding to an immediate witness of the Spirit, giving to the believer in his own consciousness the evidence of his acceptance with God; the disciples teaching that the promise of pardon is based on certain conditions, that these conditions, with the promises annexed, are contained in the gospel; and that when the sinner's own consciousness testifies to an acceptance of the conditions, the evidence of his pardon is found in the promise annexed to the conditions.

(5) In regard to baptism—action, subjects and design. Methodists will sprinkle, pour or immerse; disciples regard the "one baptism" as immersion. Methodists practice infant baptism; disciples do not. Methodists attach but little significance to baptism; disciples

teach that, to the believing penitent, baptism is for the remission of sins.

(6) In church government.

These are the main points of difference, and quite enough to consider at one sitting.

Mind, Carnal. 1. Is the "carnal mind" of Rom. 7:7, the mind of the Jew seeking justification by works of law, or the mind of any unconverted person?

2. Is the "enmity" of the same verse, the opposition to God's righteousness or plan of justification, or the enmity of any sinner?

1. The carnal mind, or mind of the flesh, belongs to every Gentile as well as to every Jew, and to the converted, we take it, as well as to the unconverted. It is described in the previous chapter (verse 23) as a law in the members that wars against the law of the mind, and brings man into captivity to the law of sin. The Jewish law, as its rewards were earthly and fleshly, did not suppress this carnal mind, nor give strength to the spiritual nature to overcome it. The gospel, in supplying spiritual motives, and furnishing spiritual aids, frees its subject from the law of sin and death—gives him power to restrain and subdue it. But it still exists, and calls for the constant cultivation of our spiritual nature to preserve us from a reassertion of fleshly dominion. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot [unaided] do the things that ye would." We have both flesh and spirit—a carnal mind and a spiritual mind. They are in conflict. The gospel comes to the aid of the spirit for the conquest of the flesh. "If ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

2. The enmity spoken of is the enmity that asserts itself even in the saint, against the law of God, and which makes a life of holiness a perpetual conflict with evil.

Mind, Does It Grow? Does the mind or spirit really *grow* —or is it always the same, and what seems to be its growth merely the growth of the cerebral organ through which the mental faculty is manifested?

Doubtless what many times *seems* to be a growth of spirit is merely the removal of obstructions to its manifestations; and what seems to be a dwarfing and enfeebling of the spirit, as in old age, is merely an enfeebling of the organs through which spirit manifests itself. But of the child Jesus it is said (Luke 2:40, 52) that he "waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom," and that he "increased in wisdom and stature." Christians are exhorted to feed on the sincere milk of the Word "that they may *grow* thereby"—evidently not a growth of the body. They are also exhorted to "be *strong* in the Lord"—evidently not strength of body. Also to "be renewed in the spirit of their mind"—an expression which reaches to the very essence of spirit; there is to be "renewal" there. Most certainly a created nature which feeds on knowledge and flourishes in the atmosphere of truth and love, and has capacities which are subject to culture, must be capable of growth.

But if subject to growth, we are told it is perishable. Certainly, spirit can perish, but its perishing is not the loss of existence. Its real life is a life of truth, of goodness, of holiness; and when cut off from these, it perishes—is dead in ignorance and in sin. To be alive to Satan, is to be dead to God. The wicked perish in their own corruption.

Money, Use of. Is it right to borrow money to give to the Messiah's cause? On the one hand there is a desire to appear liberal, an unwillingness to be behind others, that prompts one to give; on the other, there is a sincere desire to avoid the danger of growing parsimonious by neglecting to give to the church.

The question comes from a brother at college on funds borrowed from kind brethren (at 10 per cent.), studying for the ministry, whose death during the four years might cause a loss to them.

Such questions can only be settled in the light of the circumstances belonging to each case. A man may borrow money to give to the work of the Lord, who knows that he has the means to pay, and can pay at the time promised. But if he has not the means of paying, and borrows without knowing when he can return it, if ever, he is cultivating benevolence at the expense of honesty—and that is an expense he has no right to incur.

If it is meant to ask whether a student who has borrowed money on which to educate himself, should give to benevolent objects while that debt remains unpaid, we say no. He would not be giving his own, but that which belongs to others. If it is meant to ask whether he did right to borrow the money on which to complete his education, we answer that depends on the understanding had with his creditors. If they loaned the money without other security than his note, accepting the risks as to his life and health, all right. But such matters should be very fully understood between borrower and lender.

Moses, Body of. Will you please to give us your view of Jude 9? What is signified by "the body of Moses"? Was the contention over the body of Moses, literally; or was it the Jewish economy called the "body of Moses," as the church is called "the body of Christ"?

There is no good reason known to us for departing from the literal interpretation. The body of Moses was,

in its burial-place, concealed from the knowledge of men —we suppose to guard against a superstitious or idolatrous use of it. That it would suit the purposes of Satan to direct attention to the body of Moses, and excite this superstitious reverence for it, is altogether reasonable to suppose; and this suggests a good reason why Michael the archangel should baffle his quest and disappoint his purpose. It is curious, however, that there is nothing in the Old Testament or in Jewish tradition in support of the allusion of Jude.

There is in Zech. 3:1-3 an account of Joshua and Satan as adversaries, and the very words that Jude spoke are found here—"The Lord rebuke thee." As this contest clearly relates to the deliverance of Israel from captivity, many have thought that "the body of Moses" relates to the Jewish people. It is probable, however, that both Zechariah and Jude had knowledge of the original tradition respecting Michael and Satan, and that the imagery of Zechariah is borrowed from it.

R. **Nathanael.** When Nathanael came to Christ, he said: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile.' In whom did Jesus mean there was no guile?

Nathanael, beyond doubt. An Israelite was a fleshly descendant of Jacob, but "an Israelite *indeed*" was one who, like Jacob when his name was changed to Israel, had wrestled in prayer with God and prevailed. See Gen. 32:24-28. Nathanael under the fig-tree (John 1:49) had probably been thus engaged in earnest, importunate prayer, and Jesus calls him a true son of Israel. He was "without guile"—free from falsehood and deceit; and in this was different from Jacob, who before he became Israel was a cunning supplanter. That our Lord had this in mind, we think altogether probable.

The reference to Jacob and Israel also accounts for the language in verse 51, which is clearly based on the facts recorded in Genesis 28. As Jacob in a dream saw the heavens opened and the angels ascending and descending, so this true Israelite would see a more blessed communication between earth and heaven opened through the mission of the Son of God.

New Testament, Canon of. Enclosed please find a copy of the statements made by a Roman Catholic in regard to the New Testament, which if you will answer through the columns of the STANDARD you will confer a great favor on the brethren here:

1. That there was no such book as the New Testament before the end of the fourth century. 2. That previous to that time no scholar—not even St. Augustine—knew which books were authentic. 3. That the number of writings claiming to be authentic, if bound together, would have made a book as large as the tabernacle stage. 4. That from these innumerable manuscripts a Provincial Council of the Catholic Church, held at Hippo, in Africa, A. D. 395, formed the New Testament canon. 5. That the canon was then approved by the Pope, and the New Testament has so stood ever since.

To condense into as small a space as possible what needs to be said, we quote from B. A. Hinsdale's book, "The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels," to which we refer our querist and others for fuller information.

"1. The New Testament Canon was substantially settled from the close of the second century. Several interesting questions yet remained, but the make-up of the Canon was almost complete. Hence Origen talks in the next century of the 'Canonical Books.'

"2. So soon as we find a Canon of Christian Scripture, we find it named. At first it was called *Novum Instrumentum,* or New Instrument; afterward *Novum*

Testamentum, or New Testament. Both words are found in Tertullian, but he says the second was the more common.

"3. It is a suggestive, as well as happy, coincidence that about the time the Canon was definitely settled, Chrysostom gave to the collected Scriptures, Old and New, the name 'Bible.'

"4. Of course, the union of believers in the congregations and in the one body, was favorable to the preservation and publication of the Scriptures. . . .

"5. It is constantly asserted, and very commonly believed, that the early councils played a very important part in settling the Canon. It was really very humble. The work was substantially done before the first council sat, by the concurrent voice of the church. . . . Passing by the Council of Laodicea, the third of Carthage was the first that considered the Canon. As there were still some lingering doubts touching one or two books, the council very properly gave its opinion. This opinion is entitled to such consideration as properly belongs to the mature judgment of a body of men who had a full knowledge of the subject they were dealing with, and who were intent on maintaining the sacredness of the Scriptures. Later councils reaffirmed the Canon, not so much for controversial as declaratory purposes. Nor are there in early literature any traces of violent and heated controversies touching this question. Heretics disputed certain books, and the Catholic Christians maintained them; some sections of the Christian world temporarily held to certain books that other sections repudiated; but, on the whole, the Canon was settled with singular unanimity.

"The ancient church did not admit books into the Canon without due consideration. No book passed un-

challenged. Some were admitted promptly, others after long scrutiny and investigation.

"I conclude this summary view of the Canon with a passage from Dr. Davidson:

" 'The preceding observations show that the formation of the New Testament Canon was *gradual.* The collection was not made by one man, one council, at one time, or in one place. The adherents of the Christian religion in different lands came to agree in the same conclusion *progressively* and by *tacit consent.* They did so independently, to a great extent, in countries remote from one another. They judged by internal evidence, by tradition, by the fact of the writers being apostles or apostolic men. Some relied on one conclusion, some on another; the majority perhaps on ecclesiastical tradition; the most reflecting and critical on internal evidence. Slowly and surely did they arrive at the entire separation of the sacred Scriptures from the spurious imitations which were then current. And in the result of their judgment modern scholars commonly acquiesce.' "

Opinion, Liberty of. 1. A man who was once a member of the church of Christ, but for fifteen years past has been a Universalist, talked his doctrine and acted it out in his life, and still stoutly maintains that nothing but Universalism is the truth, makes application for membership in a congregation of brethren where the above facts are all known. Ought they to receive him without a confession and a renunciation of his heretical views?

2. Can a man be a member of the church of Christ, and held as in good standing, and do no violence to our views of Christianity, and at the same time believe in Spiritualism, Mormonism, Universalism, or Free Loveism, or any one of these isms, or maybe all of them?

1. The fact that a man held the opinion that God would, in some way, finally save all men, should not exclude him from Christian fellowship, if he has faith

in Christ, reveres his word, and walks in his commandments. But if he holds Universalism as *the gospel* which is to be preached to men, and insists on teaching and advocating it, then he can have no place with us, for we have no such gospel to preach, and no such bond of fellowship. If he left the church on account of his Universalism, and remains unchanged, we have not changed on that question, and we do not see either how he can apply for membership or why it ought to be granted to him.

2. A man may be a member of the church of Christ and have very mistaken views on many subjects. So long as he clings to faith in the Son of God and walks worthy of him, no one has a right to trouble him about his notions on other matters. But he has no right to propagate such notions in a way that will misrepresent or dishonor the church, or cause dissension.

But some of the things mentioned by our querist can not coexist with a true Christian faith or Christian character

A Mormon, for instance, receives other revelations as divine besides those in the Bible. He can not unite with us on the Bible alone. A Spiritualist, in the present sense of that term, does not believe in the divinity of Jesus, nor in his death for sin, nor in his supreme authority. Of course, they can not unite with us. Our creeds differ fundamentally. Free-lovers are farther away still. We can not extend fellowship to any who do not acknowledge the divinity and supreme lordship of Jesus the Christ or who will not be governed by his laws.

Q **Ordination.** An Episcopalian minister declined to partake of the Lord's Supper with us, after preaching to us a very acceptable sermon, on the ground that our elder was not an ordained

minister. He thinks he has good reasons for thinking that one who administers the sacraments should be an ordained minister. Will you give us the Scripture on that subject? Why do they differ from us? Are not their preachers educated men?

It is hard to find Scripture on a subject unknown to the Scriptures. In the first place, the Scriptures know nothing about "Episcopalian ministers." They are a class altogether too modern for Scriptural authority. Of course, as the New Testament knows nothing about them, it knows nothing of their participation in the Lord's Supper. The *disciples* came together on the first day of the week to break bread. If the gentleman referred to was a disciple of Christ—disciples according to the commission in Matt. 28: 19—he had a right with all other disciples to partake of the Lord's Supper. If not, then there is no occasion to worry because he did not share in the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

In the second place, the Scriptures know nothing of "the sacraments," and, of course, nothing of "administering the sacraments." They tell us of "the Lord's Supper." There is positively nothing in the New Testament making it necessary that this should be presided over by an ordained minister. All Christians are priests to God, and have a right, by virtue of their priesthood, to "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 2: 5). They have the same right to break the loaf and pour out the wine, and give thanks for them and hand them to their brethren, that they have to sing or pray. All this in virtue of the anointing they have received from God—not by the laying on of hands, but by their acceptance of and submission to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is as a matter of *order* that certain persons are selected to perform this task—the order and

prosperity of God's house requiring that each task shall be performed by those best qualified to perform it. Those who are set apart to rule and guide, should be set apart by the laying on of hands, accompanied with fasting and prayer. But if there is none such present, there is no good reason why the church should not designate one of their number to preside at the Lord's table. This notion of a *sacrament* robs the ordinance of its true character.

It would require more space than we can spare to state *why* the Episcopalians occupy the position they do on this question, as it involves the whole question of sacramental grace and priestly succession. They brought with them from the Roman Catholics—indeed, from time antedating the existence of the *Roman* Catholic Church—the idea of a special priestly order in the church, to which is committed the sacraments, and upon whose ministrations the validity of the observance of the sacraments is made to depend. But it is of later date than the apostolic age, and is one of the marked features of the great apostasy. It is one of the idols which, in pleading for the restoration of apostolic Christianity, we have been compelled to smite down. God's priests—God's clergy—are the whole household of faith.

Persecution, By Whom Practiced? Did any religious body that practiced immersion exclusively ever persecute any other religious body by cruel treatment? If so, where can I get the information?

Oh, yes. The Greek Church practices immersion exclusively, yet has shown many times a persecuting spirit. The Roman Catholic Church practiced immersion exclusively (except in case of the sick and dying) for centuries during which she was drunk with the blood of saints. The Baptists, who practice only believers'

baptism, make their boast, and we believe justly, that they never persecuted. But, truth to say, they have not had many opportunities. We have seen men in their ranks—and in ours, too—that we are thankful have not that power. It is unquestionable, however, that believers' baptism preserves a distinction between the church and the world that is a great safeguard against the power to persecute; while infant membership, universally prevailing, destroys such distinction, and loads the church with the crimes of the state.

Polygamy in Early Church. 1. Can you tell us where the proof is that polygamy was in the primitive churches, and that Paul handled it very tenderly, fearing to give offense, only requiring that none such should hold office?

2. Is the church a republican government, and should the officers be elected by a majority of the members, old and young?

3. Is ordination necessary to an appointment of officers? What constitutes "let these first be proven," "lay hands suddenly on no man"?

4. An ordained elder moves to a congregation near by, is elected again. Is it necessary to ordain him again?

1. There is no *proof* of it. Many have suspected that there was a *hint* of it in 1 Tim. 3:2, where Paul says that a bishop must be "the husband of one wife"—implying, it is thought, that only in the case of bishops was this insisted on. We see no force in this. It might as reasonably be argued that because the bishop is not to be given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre, therefore the members of the church generally could be given to wine, could fight, and be greedy and avaricious. We take it that the import of the phrase is, that he must be, or must have been, a married man, with a family of his own—superior to others not in having but one wife, but in the skill and faithfulness with which he rules in his family. All the directions concerning marriage in the

New Testament are based on the idea of the union of one man and one woman. No man is taught how to behave towards more than one wife.

2. We should be careful how we apply our political terms to the government of the New Testament church. The *family* idea, much more than that of the *state,* enters into the church. "Entreat the elder men as *fathers,* the elder women as *mothers,* the younger men and women as *brethren* and *sisters*" (1 Tim. 5:1, 2). "Let the younger be in subjection to the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another" (1 Pet. 5:5). Yet the instance furnished of a choice of servants (Acts 6) shows that the choice was made by the multitude of disciples, but how the choice was made we are not told. It is wise, in view of the incompetency of many to judge in such matters, to let a committee of wise and godly persons suggest or nominate the persons whom, after mature deliberation, they deem qualified for the post, and present them to the church for approval.

3. It is not necessary to their *election,* nor is it absolutely necessary to their acceptable service. In reference to the passages you quote, we presume the persons were *proved* by being called to the performance of various duties before they were appointed permanently to the work of either elders or deacons; and before they were elected to those places. Election and ordination should both proceed on the basis of the *proved* fitness of the persons—the proof being found in the acceptableness of the service they have previously rendered, at the call of the elders, or by the approval of the church.

Prayer, Answer to. Will God bless the brotherhood in behalf of our requests—that is, if, in "spirit and in truth," without their knowing it, we thus plead in their behalf? Shall we pray for the conversion of sinners, or is the sinner converted inde-

pendent of God? In short, can we not aid the sinner in praying for him? Is it correct for us to pray for the assistance of the Holy Spirit for ourselves?

1. Read Rom. 15:30-32; Acts 12:5; Col. 4:12; Phil. 1:19; Philem. 22; 1 Pet. 3:12. There is nothing more clearly taught in the New Testament than that the prayers of Christians in behalf of others, even when the persons prayed for know nothing about it—or, if they do know, can not aid in their fulfillment—are acceptable to God.

2. Certainly we are taught to pray for all men (1 Tim. 3:1-4). If it is God's will that all be saved, then we are in harmony with his will when we pray that any may be saved; but we have no right to conclude that prayer *alone* will save them, nor to regard that as a true prayer which does not prompt us to all possible effort to save those for whom we pray.

3. It is certainly right to pray for the assistance of the Holy Spirit (Luke 11:13; Eph. 3:16).

It is not our business to decide *how* God will answer prayer, nor to dictate to him about answering our prayers. Our duty is to cast all our anxieties and burdens at his feet, and trust him to give us what is best, and to give it to us as his infinite wisdom decides to be best.

Prayer, Lord's. Why do not your preachers use the "Lord's Prayer" as a *form?*

1. Because it was not given as a form. "After this *manner* pray ye," not after this form. Nor is it given twice in the same form. Compare Matt. 6:9-13 with Luke 11:2-4.

2. Because it was meant especially for that time. The kingdom of God was then proclaimed as *at hand,* and they were taught to pray, "Thy kingdom come."

The kingdom *did* come, and in the original sense of the petition it has been answered.

3. Because other subsequent prayers show that there is much that belongs to our spiritual interests that is not expressed in this prayer. See John 17; Eph. 3:14-21; Col. 1:9-13.

4. Because there is in it no recognition of the mediation of Jesus Christ. See John 16:23, 24.

These are sufficient reasons for declining to adhere to this as a *form* of prayer. But its simplicity, its spirituality, its comprehensiveness and its exaltation of the kingdom of God over all other interests, are sufficient reasons why it should be studied and imitated in our prayers.

Prayer. What are the legitimate results of prayer?

Communion with God brings all the results of communion with any who are just and pure and good, only in the highest sense, as he is infinitely wise and just and good. It cultivates a sense of dependence. It keeps us in the fear of God. It encourages us to trust his promises. It gives us peace in committing all our ways to him in well-doing. It brings us into submission to the divine will, for the highest effort of prayer is that in which we hush all the rebellious impulses of our nature, and are enabled to say, "Not my will, but thine, be done." It has the effect, therefore, to inspire us with proper feelings and sentiments, and to win us from everything of an opposite character. Among its most precious results is the cultivation of that reverence for God's will that will lead us, day by day, to read his word with earnest desire to conform to all its requirements.

Prosperity, Worldly. The question arose in our Sunday-school whether or not God now prospers men temporally for

obedience to his laws and service in his cause, as he did anciently the people and kings of Judah. Please answer in the "Querists' Drawer" of the CHRISTIAN STANDARD.

No, not as he did anciently, for these earthly blessings were *the* reward of obedience then; now, the reward is spiritual good. Hence, the new covenant contains not a single promise of earthly good. Compare Deuteronomy 28 with the new covenant in Hebrews 8 and see the marked contrast in this respect.

There are promises of earthly good to the Christian; but they are ever subordinated to the idea of spiritual good. If, for the soul's good, it is better that earthly blessings be withheld, they are withheld. If they can be enjoyed without harm to higher interests, they are given. The great promise is, that *all things*—prosperity and adversity—joy and sorrow—health and sickness—shall "work together for good"—that is, ultimate and eternal good; and with this we must be contented.

It is true that, on natural principles, temperance, modesty, honesty, benevolence, will bring thrift and wealth. But this is no more true to the Christian than to any other man. He has no right to expect earthly prosperity on the ground that he is a child of God, for his Father may see that it would be his ruin. We have a right to ask what we think we need, and to trust God to interest himself in all that belongs to us; but it should ever be remembered that his care is pledged to see us safely through to the better world, ready for eternal bliss —not to pamper us by the way and strengthen the ties that hold us here. "Give us our daily bread" is the one petition in the Lord's Prayer; for earthly good; all the others are for spiritual good. Let us pray more for pure hearts, an obedient spirit, love of good and hate of evil,

growth in grace and meetness for heaven; and less for big farms and big fortunes.

Providence, Special. Please give a synopsis of the Scripture teachings on the subject of "special providences" under the Christian dispensation. Also, are we to look for direct answer to prayer if in accordance with the will of God?

The subject is too large to be handled satisfactorily within such limits as bound this department. We may say in brief:

1. There were, beyond question, many special providences in the ministry of our Lord—that is, instances in which special blessings were conferred on individuals and communities, not by the regular processes of nature. If it be said this was by miracle, we answer that it nevertheless proves that there were special providences, and brought about in such a way that the regular operations of Nature were not for a moment interrupted, and felt no jar.

2. The Bible just as clearly records wonderful special providences in which there was no miracle. Witness the history of Joseph, and that of Esther. In one case a dream, in the other, a sleeplessness, was the pivot on which everything turned.

3. To say that God knows everything beforehand, and that he can not be changed, will not suffice as an objection to answers to prayer; for men can pray to men and have their prayers answered, without in the least interfering with God's foreknowledge—and it would be strange indeed if God could not himself answer prayers without violence to his foreknowledge.

4. Our Lord not only taught his disciples to pray, but encouraged them to pray on the ground that their heavenly Father knew them, loved them and cared for

them. The apostles also taught this. It was not merely for the sake of the reflex influence of prayer on their own spirits that they were thus taught to pray for others, on whom their prayers could naturally exert no such influence. Such texts as this can never be explained, if there is no special providence: "Be careful for nothing; but *in everything,* by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God."

5. But it must not be left out of view that the special providences of the Christian dispensation have reference to *spiritual* ends. God does not specially deal with us, except to make us holy and fit us for heaven; and this involves losses, crosses, trials and tribulations, as well as gains and prosperities. Whatever is needful to develop us, purify us, strengthen us, and bring us into closer fellowship with God—that is involved in his special dealings with us. It is not that we may be rich, or famous, or powerful; but that we may be humble and pure and good and heroic and enduring. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." Our comfort in believing in special providences should be—not that we shall be sure of health and safety and prosperity, but—that in our efforts to be good and noble, God will never leave us nor forsake us, but will cause all things to work together for our good.

6. There are various means by which special providences may be wrought: by a *combination* of ordinary events; by *impressions* made on the mind; by dreams; by angelic ministrations, etc.

7. The very idea of *special* providences carries with it the thought that there is a *general* providence which constantly concerns us, and the demands of which we must not for a moment ignore. It is absurd to expect *special* providences to accomplish that for us which

may be readily gained through the ordinary channels of blessing.

8. Every well-regulated family and government has general laws, and also special arrangements where they are needed. A universe of matter may be governed by general and uniform law; a universe of mind can not be ruled in the same way. Mind must be governed according to its nature; and though mind may have laws as regular and uniform as those of matter, they are on a different plane; and where they come in contact with the laws of matter, they are, with reference to such laws, special and variable and not uniform. Living on the borderland where both classes of laws meet in their operations, we can not but recognize what are called special providences.

Punishment, Capital. In the sixth chapter of Genesis there is a verse which reads as follows: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

Was this passage done away with the old Jewish law, or was it before the law, and, like the Ten Commandments, to stand through all time? If it was changed, please show where.

It was before the law. The Ten Commandments, *as such,* were not before the law, but were the law itself. But the text referred to was before the law, and relates to civil government, and not to ecclesiastical. It belongs to the structure of society, and is meant as a safeguard of human life. The failure to respect it, and the false sympathy with murderers, rather than with society, has produced a state of things in some parts of our own country—New York City, for instance—truly alarming. The mawkish sensibility that spent itself in bewailing the fate of the murderer is now giving way to a healthier sentiment, and the conviction of Stokes is everywhere hailed with approval. God's ordination is wise and just.

Quickened, When are We? I want to ask you the following questions: When is the sinner quickened into life? Is he quickened when he believes, or when he repents, or when he confesses, or when he is baptized? My reason for asking is this: I heard a minister say in the pulpit that the sinner was quickened in the water of baptism. If he is right, I want to know it. Please give all the light necessary on the subject.

If baptism is the birth of water (John 3:5)—and on that there is no dispute among us—then we are not quickened in the water of baptism; for birth is not a quickening, but the entrance into a new state of a living being. The Scriptures clearly teach that we are begotten by the word of truth (Jas. 1:18); "begotten again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God" (1 Pet. 1:23); and that "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten of God" (1 John 5:1). Begotten by the Spirit of God through the seed of the Word, the believer is "born of water," through his baptism into Christ (John 3:5; Gal. 3:26, 27). The preacher referred to is evidently a believer in baptismal regeneration—that in the act of baptism the Holy Spirit imparts new life—a doctrine at war with the teaching of the New Testament and with the uniform teaching of the disciples, and, in our judgment, fraught with mischief. It ought to be emphatically rebuked. In that view, a sinner, although a believer and a penitent, is still destitute of spiritual life! It is not as dead *in* sin, but as dead *to* sin, that we are buried with him in baptism, to be henceforth separated from sin and consecrated to a new life of holiness. While the whole process of quickening and birth is comprehended under one general description, it by no means follows that the quickening takes place in baptism.

Reconciliation Between Brethren. What course should be taken with a member of the church who refuses to be recon-

ciled to another member, although in several years efforts have been made for reconciliation in vain, because the party refusing to be reconciled will not state the cause of grievance, and persistently refuses to state it? Should the church withdraw fellowship in such cases?

We can not say, without knowing the persons and the circumstances. If the party you complain of makes no complaint and seeks not to injure the other party, but simply avoids him and prefers not to be intimate with him, it is better not to go beyond expostulation and rebuke in dealing with him. It is a case which you can not judge, except as it involves the conduct of one party towards the other. But if he is showing hostility and seeking to injure the person against whom he refuses to state the cause of grievance, then for that unbrotherly conduct you may deal with him; but whether to the extent of excluding him from fellowship, must depend on many considerations which can only be known to the church concerned. His conduct, if he is in any way seeking to act as an enemy towards the person with whom he refuses to be reconciled, is clearly a violation of the law of love; and if it is likely to spread through the church a spirit of unkindness or to encourage revengefulness, exclusion may be necessary. If it is one of those cases of infirmity with which the church is willing to bear, and which can be borne without injury to the church, it may be best to exercise long forbearance. There is no iron rule to apply to such cases. They must be dealt with according to the aggravating or palliating circumstances in each case, with a proper regard to the peace and purity of the church on one hand, and to the spiritual welfare of the transgressor on the other.

Recreation. We had a brother to preach to us a few days ago, and in his sermon he severely condemned picnics,

barbecues, croquet, and, in fact, every amusement in which young people engage. Now, I don't want to do anything wrong, but I don't think it necessary to be so sanctified as to stand back from all recreation. His theme was, "Whatsoever we do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord," and argued that we could not play any game under those restrictions.

That all we do is to be in recognition of our obligations to the Lord, and that we are to do nothing that will bring dishonor on his name, is very clear. As a broad principle it is never to be forgotten. Whether we eat apples, or drink buttermilk, or crack nuts, or laugh, or cry, or sleep, or wake, or ride, or walk, or read, or talk, we are in it all to seek and to evince that purity, benevolence, temperance, cheerfulness, truthfulness, propriety and dignity that will cause our conduct, in its whole tenor, to glorify God. We are therefore to avoid whatever is degrading, whatever lends countenance to iniquity or to folly, whatever leads us needlessly into temptation, whatever hinders our growth in goodness, whatever would be an injurious example to others. All this is clear. But when you come to apply these principles or rules to particular lines of conduct, or to particular associations, or to this or that recreation, you will often have cases of casuistry on hand that can not be easily disposed of, and there will arise differences of judgment among good men. Their applications of these principles are likely to be governed by their own tastes, education, surroundings, etc., and they will often imagine they are expounders of truth when they are but dealing in strongly prejudiced opinions which they have no right to impose on others. In such cases every man must be fully persuaded in his own mind, availing himself of the best judgment of the wise, and always being keenly alive to the danger of self-deception. We have seen men to whom croquet is an

abomination, who yet have no scruples about indulging by the hour in gossip, sometimes to the serious injury of others. We know others who decry all social parties, that have no scruples about cracking jokes by the hour when they can find congenial company. This only shows how our tastes and prejudices enter into our conceptions of duty, and how blind one may be to his own faults and perils, while indulging in hypercriticism of the faults of others.

In our judgment, recreation is needful, and laughter is healthful to body and mind. Some of the most contemptibly mean and vile men we have ever known were men that were too solemn to laugh. There is often great need, not only of cessation from toil, but of hearty participation in such recreations as are agreeable to us. A proper regard to the laws of life and health demands this, and we may therefore as truly enjoy such recreations in the name of the Lord Jesus, as we can engage in honorable toil in his name. We do not honor Christ by ignoring the laws of health. But the world is given up largely to folly, and it is difficult to take a step in the direction of mirthfulness without falling into evil associations. It requires circumspection. We suppose that picnics and social gatherings of various kinds may be not only free from evil, but positively beneficial in their influence; yet there is constant danger of their perversion to evil. So of every form of recreation. What then? Never go into company—never give way to mirth—never indulge in recreation? As well cease to eat and drink, because these are constantly abused and perverted into sinful indulgence. But these perversions and excesses should put us constantly on our guard.

1. Seek recreation only when it is needful—when relaxation from toil and care is demanded for the health

of the body or the mind. Work is the rule; recreation the exception.

2. Let not your recreations or amusements be at war with either the purity or the dignity of your Christian profession.

3. Be careful of your associations. Never go into the company of the ungodly for amusement. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." Stand not in the way of sinners; walk not in the counsel of the ungodly; sit not in the seat of sinners.

4. Be careful of your example. What may be harmless to you, may be harmful to others. If so, deny yourself for their sake, and cause not your weak brother to stumble.

5. Keep on safe ground. Venture not on *doubtful* territory. Always give the benefit of the doubt to the safe side.

There is need of constant warning against the dangers that surround us. There is but little need to advocate recreations. The tide sets in that way strong enough; what we need is *restraint*. If some men go too far in denouncing everything in the shape of recreations, and thereby injure their own cause, it must yet be remembered that there is much to justify them in sounding an alarm against the popular currents of pleasure. "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation."

Regeneration. Will you please explain Matt. 19:27-29? Several readers of the STANDARD will be anxious to read your answer.

There is much difficulty in deciding what is meant here by the term *regeneration* or *renovation*. No one supposes it to refer to personal regeneration, such as is taught in John 3:1-5. It is, we believe, universally regarded as meaning *a new order of things*. But whether

it relates to the revolutionary process going on during the personal ministries of John and Jesus, and our Lord meant to say, "Ye who have followed me in the regenerating process now going on in Israel;" or, to the renovation to be accomplished by the gospel during the gospel dispensation, making the meaning to be, "In the regeneration, ye who have followed me;" or, to a future state of things such as is contemplated in Rev. 21 : 3-5, it is somewhat difficult to determine. Our own conclusions are as follows:

1. That it is not a promise to those who *had* followed him in the regeneration, but to those who had followed him he gave a promise that, in the regeneration—a then future new state of things—these honors should be conferred on them.

2. That the word *regeneration* refers to the approaching gospel dispensation—when there would be a new lawgiver, a new covenant, a new priesthood, a new kingdom, a membership made up of new creatures, and new spiritual forces would be put in operation for the regeneration of the race.

3. That the apostles sitting on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, is figurative language, accommodated to Jewish modes of thought, intended to set forth the authority with which they would be invested over spiritual Israel when Jesus was exalted to kingly power (see Luke 22 : 28-30) ; and that it began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost after Jesus was exalted to the heavens, "Lord of all."

There is, indeed, a promise that reaches into the eternal future, but that is found in verse 29.

The twelve tribes of Israel, as a type, represent the spiritual Israel over which the apostles were commissioned to rule.

Religion, Getting. Is there such a thing as getting religion? If so, how do we get it, and what is it to be got? Please give me your explanation, for I want to know.

"Getting religion" is a popular phrase, growing out of the idea that God sheds down from heaven converting power on sinners when they seek him, or when the church pleads for them. It is something that is *sought* and *found,* and hence they talk of "getting it." But,

1. All that is to be sought and found, is made known to us in the gospel, and we *get* it, when we seek for it, according to the gospel. The gospel says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." When we perform the conditions, we receive what is promised; but we receive it *by faith,* trusting God to fulfill his promises. We are also promised that we shall receive the Holy Spirit, if we repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38). But the Holy Spirit is not a material substance, making its presence known by excitement of the nerves, burning sensations and emotional excesses. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance" (Gal. 5:22, 23).

2. This is not what the Scriptures term *religion.* "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world" (Jas. 1:26, 27). As here presented, religion is something to be *practiced,* not something to be *got.* It is to be practiced by those who have been made the subjects of the converting power of the gospel. We have not space, at present, to speak of the import of the original term, and of its use in the New Testament. We may do so at some future time.

Repentance and Faith. I wish you would harmonize Mark 1:15 with Acts 2:38, or with the Philippian jailer. It seems in the first that repentance comes first, and in the second, repentance last. Was it because it was spoken under different commissions or dispensations?

The requirement of Mark 1:5 was made of those who were already believers in God—the Jews. That in Acts 16:31 was addressed to a heathen who had no faith in God or in Christ. On the basis of their *faith in God,* the Jews were called upon to repent, and *believe the gospel*—that is, the glad tidings that "the kingdom of God is at hand." To turn away from their sins would be the best preparation for receiving the glad tidings concerning the coming kingdom. But in Acts 2:38 the case is different from both the others. They already were convinced of the truth concerning the Messiah; their question sprang from this conviction; and on the basis of this faith in Jesus as the Messiah, Peter calls on them to repent and be baptized. Here are the different cases:

PERSONS.

1. Jews before the death of Christ.
2. Jews after the death of Christ.
3. A Gentile.

PRESENT STATUS.

1. Believers in God.
2. Believers in the Messiahship of Jesus.
3. An unbeliever and idolater.

REQUIREMENTS.

1. Put away your sins and receive the glad tidings of the coming kingdom.
2. Repent and be baptized upon the name of Jesus Christ.
3. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

It will be seen that the faith required in Mark 1:15 *last,* is not the same faith as that which was required *first* of the jailer. Faith in Christ is not enjoined in Mark 1:

15, but faith that the kingdom was at hand. And if they had repented they would have believed this, for their wickedness was that which blinded them to the truth concerning the kingdom of the Messiah.

Resurrection, Order of. 1 Cor. 15:23: "But every man in his own order." What is the meaning of the word "order"? Job 19:26: "And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." I Cor. 15:44: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." In the above, Job claims that after his body has been consumed, he shall yet see God in his flesh. Paul says our bodies are sown natural bodies, but that they are raised spiritual bodies. How then can Job see God in the flesh? P. RODECKER.

Properly, the original term means not *a series,* but a cohort, a division of an army, and therefore most probably refers here, not to order of succession, but to *rank,* It is not impossible, however, that it was meant to indicate order of succession. First, Christ; then those who are Christ's; then the wicked.

Reward, Youth vs. Age. Does the Bible teach that we may live until old, then obey the gospel and receive as great a reward as one who has spent his life in the good work?

We are not aware that the Bible teaches anything on the question, except so far as the parable (Matt. 20: 1-16) of the laborers in the vineyard may *in principle* involve that doctrine. In dispensing grace the Lord does not proceed on the principle of *rewards and punishments* —not at all. If a youth of twelve years accepts Christ, what does he receive? Forgiveness, adoption and the promises of grace. If a sinner of seventy years accepts Christ, what does he receive? The same. If the former die in Christ at fifteen, what is his destiny? Eternal life. If the latter die at eighty, what is his destiny? Eternal life. The capacity of one may be larger than that of the

other for heavenly enjoyment; but *each has all he can receive.*

Sabbath Never Changed. When and where was the Sabbath changed from the seventh to the first day? Who made the change, and where is the record of it? Why was this change made?

The Sabbath never was changed from the seventh to the first day. The Sabbath belonged to "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones;" and although it was glorious, it was a glory "to be done away"—the Sabbath along with the rest. The "ministration of the Spirit," which abides, has no seventh-day Sabbath in it (2 Cor. 3:7-11).

Sabbatarianism, Is It Christian? Is not Christian Sabbatarianism as purely Papal as sprinkling and pouring? as pedobaptism and infant membership?

There is no such thing as *Christian* Sabbatarianism. All the Sabbatarianism that prevails is *Jewish;* it rests not on any commandment of Christ, or any apostolic precedent, but on the law which was given by Moses. It can not be called *Papal,* for the popes do not countenance it; nor *Protestant,* for Protestants generally do not hold to what is now called Sabbatarianism—that is, the observance of the Sabbath on the basis and in the spirit of the Jewish law—the observance of the seventh day. Nor do those who practice it derive it from Papal tradition, but from the Old Testament. They are generally so free from Papal tradition as to reject sprinkling, pouring and infant membership. Their mistake is in regarding the Ten Commandments, just as they were given from Sinai, as still of binding authority; and they are much more consistent than those who admit these premises, and then attempt to prove that the observance of the first day of the week is a fulfillment of that law.

Saints, Condition after Death. Did our Saviour and the apostles in their day on this earth teach that when the bodies of the saints die that the life or spirit passes immediately into heaven and would be made perfectly happy?

Did they teach that there would be a general judgment at the end of time?

Also, did they teach that all the saints admitted into heaven before the general judgment shall give an account for their sins committed in their bodies while living here on this earth, at the above-mentioned judgment?

1. They did not teach, so far as we know, that the spirit "passes *immediately* into heaven and would be made *perfectly* happy" at death. The perfection of happiness is after the resurrection, and the reunion of body and spirit. But they did teach that on the very day of death the spirit would be in *paradise*—wherever that is; they taught that "*happy* are the dead that die in the Lord;" they taught that to Christians absence from the body was presence with the Lord.

2. The dead, small and great, are to stand before God in judgment. The grave is to give up their bodies, and Hades their spirits, that they may be judged (Rev. 20: 11-15).

Salvation by Third Person. I heard a preacher say that if baptism was for the remission of sins, salvation depended on the third person; then a person could not be saved without some one to administer the ordinance of baptism; and that made our salvation depend on the third person. How would you meet such an argument?

If the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, then to bring the sinner within reach of the power of God depends on human instrumentality, for "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." "But how

shall they hear without a preacher?" A person, then, can not be saved without some one to preach the Word, or to make known the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. If it be said that they can read for themselves and believe, we answer, they can not read without some one to teach them to read, nor without others to print and bind the book out of which they are to read. This is one of the shallowest of cavils. The truth is that we are dependent on human instrumentality at every step in learning and accepting salvation; and in the absence of this human instrumentality the heathen nations live and die without the gospel.

What mean the missionary enterprises, the protracted meetings, the family instruction, the Sunday-schools, the prayings and strivings of the church, if sinners are to be saved without human instrumentality?

But let it not be forgotten that when the Scriptures propose salvation on certain conditions, it is always implied that there is opportunity and ability to learn and perform these conditions. Impossibilities are not required.

Salvation, Is It Arbitrary? Is salvation an arbitrary or sovereign act of God? If so, what does God do for the sinner when he saves him? Is the sinner forgiven of that he has no conception of?

1. No. Salvation is deliverance from sin—from its dominion and practice as well as from its guilt. "He hath sent him to bless you *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*" (Acts 3:26). "He gave himself for our sins, *that he might deliver us from this present evil world*" (Gal. 1:4). "He suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *that he might bring us to God.* . . . He bore our sins in his own body on the tree, *that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness*"

(1 Pet. 3:18; 2:24). All this, as well as forgiveness, is included in the salvation of which Jesus is the author. It will be seen that, in the nature of things, this can not be regarded as "an arbitrary or sovereign act of God," for it is essential to salvation that the sinner shall acquiesce in God's purpose. There is no salvation realized in his case until he yields to the convicting and persuasive power of God's truth and love, and submits his heart and life to the purifying and controlling power of this truth and love. It follows, too, that God's appointments in the case must be, not arbitrary, but *adapted to the spiritual nature of man*—to his judgment, his conscience and his affections. It is the excellency of the gospel that it does thus address itself to man's capacities and wants, and does not assert a merely arbitrary power. Its words are "spirit and life."

2. We presume that no sinner has a full conception of the curse of sin from which he is delivered, either in its guilt, its defilement or its horrible dominion. He is not yet in a sufficiently pure atmosphere, nor has he yet a sufficiently purified vision, to see the naked ugliness, pollution and curse of sin. But if the sinner has "*no* conception" of sin as polluting and damning, he of course will not seek forgiveness. Some are free from gross crimes, and live uprightly among men; but that any man in the light of the divine law, requiring supreme love to God and love to our neighbor equal to our love of self, should have no conception of failure and sin, requiring forgiveness; or that he should have no conception of the difference between his moral life and a life of consecration to Christ, is to us inconceivable. Even his moral excellence he owes to Christian influences. The grace of God, through Christian parents, a Christian home, Christian associations, and reigning Christian principles, has

made him what he is, and has, indirectly, saved him from a thousand curses of sin. For all this, as well as for all that he may yet become, through the grace of God, he should give his heart and life to Jesus, the Christ.

Salvation of Grace. MR. EDITOR:—In your August 17 article, entitled "Campbellism versus Calvinism," I notice this passage: "The sinner believes and determines to obey. He inquires, 'How shall I accept? What token of my acceptance shall I render?' And Campbellism replies, 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'" I would ask where within the lids of the Bible do you find this declaration? St. Paul says, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any one should boast."

To say that man by his own will and act can remit his sins (and virtually that is what your doctrine teaches), is to deny the office of the Holy Spirit. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." Turn from your sins, was all Peter said. This every one could do, or resolve to do, if he chose. Thus saith Campbellism. I ask if you are capable of doing this without divine aid? and answer *emphatically*, No. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? etc., etc. And such were some of you, but ye are washed; but ye are sanctified; but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus. How? By baptism? Nay, verily, but by the Spirit of our God. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of *regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

A Methodist, and according to your rendering of the term,
A CALVINIST.

The foregoing strikes us as rather confused, but we will endeavor to deal with its objections as far as we can understand them.

1. Our Methodist friend seems ignorant that any such Scripture exists. Let him turn to Acts 2: 38, and he will find *the very words* quoted in the article headed "Camp-

bellism *versus* Calvinism." What will he do with it? Let him read Luke 24:47, and he will learn that repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in the name of Jesus, among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.* In the text quoted he may learn how they were preached at Jerusalem, and therefore how they are to be preached now.

2. That salvation is not of ourselves, but of God, is clear; also, that no man, by his own will and act, can remit his own sins. But that is not what Peter taught when he used that language on the day of Pentecost, nor what we teach. What we teach is, that the sinner can *accept* the salvation which God has provided, by complying with the terms of the gospel; and this we surely can do, or the terms would never have been propounded.

3. Our querist asks if we can turn from our sins without divine aid; and answers, "No." We join him in the answer. But is divine aid given to enable us to comply with the terms, or does it save us unconditionally? If the latter, then gospel conditions are vain. If the former, then the objection has no force; the conditions are there and must be obeyed, and the fact that God aids us to obey them surely does not prove that the conditions are not to be obeyed.

4. The texts quoted by our querist are in our favor. The first text quoted says that they were *washed,* sanctified and justified. This clearly refers to baptism, as nearly all evangelical commentators allow. They were to "be baptized *in the name of the Lord Jesus* for the remission of sins;" they were thus washed and justified and sanctified (set apart to a holy life) in the name of the Lord Jesus. "But," says our correspondent, "it was to be done by the Spirit of our God." Granted. But surely not without conditions! The Scriptures teach that

we are "justified by faith." Surely the Spirit does not justify services without faith. "Sanctify them through the truth" (John 17:17). Surely the Spirit does not sanctify them without the truth. And does the Spirit wash them without baptism? In all this the Spirit works through means.

So of the other text. "The washing of regeneration" refers to baptism. This is not our interpretation, but that of Catholics and Protestants alike. Baptism is not regeneration, but the washing or bath of regeneration, and is joined with "the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

All this is the arrangement of *grace*. It is great grace to offer salvation to the guilty upon such terms as the gospel proposes, rather than upon "works of righteousness"—that is, perfect obedience to law, which none could render.

Let us give our correspondent a few texts to meditate on.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16).

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

"Save yourselves from this untoward generation" (Acts 2:40).

"Then they that gladly received the word were baptized" (Acts 2:41).

Salvation During Dark Ages. The STANDARD is always a welcome visitor which I prize very highly, and it being open to all questions touching Scripture, will you please tell me who and where were the Christians during the Dark Ages? I am not well versed in history, and this question has always been a source of wonder to me. I frequently hear brothers and sisters talking about it, and by answering I hope you will confer a great

favor on many good brethren besides one who truly desires light and instruction. JOHN S. COPENHAVER.

HEBRON, W. Va.

They were in the wilderness, generally persecuted and driven to the mountains, or hunted down and delivered into the hands of their enemies. We are mostly dependent on their enemies for the knowledge we have of them, and of course must receive their testimony with many grains of allowance; but enough can be gathered from even this source to satisfy us that, as the mass of professors became corrupt in faith and practice, there were always a few "faithful among the faithless found," who stood by the word of God and protested against the reigning corruptions. They are known in history under different names, sometimes taken from the leaders of these movements, sometimes from the region of country they inhabited, etc. Hence we have Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, Albigenses, Berengarians, Lyonese, Lollards, Hussites, etc. The origin of some of these reaches back into a remote antiquity—the Waldenses, for example. As, when the Jews were carried into captivity and Jerusalem laid in ruins, there were some who still lingered amid the ruins and took pleasure in the dust and stones of the desolated city of God; so, in the antitype, when the spiritual Jerusalem was desolated and the multitudes carried into spiritual Babylon, there were always those who clung to the truth and lingered amid the ruins of the spiritual temple. And as in Babylon there were faithful men, like Daniel, who stood up for God, so even in the bosom of the apostasy there were true and faithful men who did not fail to make their voice heard for the truth. Many of them were in Babylon. See Rev. 18:4. God's people could not come out of Babylon if they were not in it.

It is vain to trace, in the history of any church, a direct succession from the apostles. But it is possible to trace the existence of individuals and of societies of believers who held to the supreme authority of the Lord Jesus, and the all-sufficiency of his word, and who kept up a continued protest against the departures from primitive faith and practice.

Much valuable information may be had in brief space in Jones' "Church History" and in Orchard's "History of the Baptists."

Sanctification of Unbelievers. Give your opinion in the STANDARD how an unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, and how the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife.

Sanctified simply *in the marriage relation.* Where a heathen husband or wife became a Christian, and the other party remained a heathen, it became a question: Can I continue to be the husband or wife of a heathen and live in all the intimacy of that relation, and still be true to Christ? Paul answered, Do not break up the marriage relation if your heathen husband or wife desires to continue with you; in view of *your* faith the relationship is counted holy in the sight of God, and *for all the purposes of marriage* the unbelieving party is accepted as holy for the sake of the believing party.

Scepter of Judah. Please explain through the "Querists' Drawer" the following: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, *until Shiloh come*" (Gen. 49: 10). With the captivity, under King Zedekiah's reign, or the seventy years' captivity, did not the scepter depart from Judah at the time of said captivity, a period of nearly six hundred years before Christ?

The word *scepter* denoted *tribal* as well as *regal* authority, and it here imports that the supremacy of Judah

among the tribes of Israel should not be lost or yielded to another. Notwithstanding the revolt of the ten tribes and the seventy years' captivity, Judah maintained its nationality, and had its own national institutions, laws and lawgivers until the coming of the Messiah. In the "Bible Commentary" we find the following note: "As regards the fulfillment of this prophecy, it is undoubted that the tribal authority and the highest place in the nation continued with Judah until the destruction of Jerusalem. It is true that after the Babylonish captivity the royalty was not in the house of Judah; but the prophecy is not express as to the possession of absolute royalty. Israel never ceased to be a nation, Judah never ceased to be a tribe with at least a tribal scepter and lawgivers, or expositors of the law, Sanhedrin or senators, and with a general pre-eminence in the land, nor was there a foreign ruler of the people till at least the time of Herod the Great, just before the birth of the Saviour; and even the Herods, though of Idumean extraction, were considered as exercising a native sovereignty in Judea, which did not quite pass away till a Roman procurator was sent thither after the reign of Archælaus, the son of Herod the Great; and at that very time the Shiloh came, the Prince of peace, to whom of right the kingdom belonged."

Scriptures Our Guide. Do not the Scriptures, especially the New Testament, purport to be our guide, socially, politically and religiously—in fact, a perfect example in all things? Please explain Lev. 5:4, 5.

1. Yes, but not in the way in which many claim. They are intended to furnish the man of God "unto all good works;" but not by presenting him detailed instruction in farming, engineering, house-building, or in municipal or State law, or even in many of the details

of Christian activity in the service of the church. The New Testament is largely a book of facts and principles and *general* precepts. It tells the Christian, *"as he has opportunity,* to do good to all men, especially to the household of faith." It trusts his good sense to judge of opportunities, and to adopt the wisest means of doing the good which the opportunity calls for. It "furnishes" him the general rule, and "furnishes" him the proper motive. But it does not propose to furnish him explicit details, as to when and how he shall do good. So in regard to duties generally; it gives the principles of righteousness and benevolence that should regulate our conduct socially, politically, and every other way. But it does not tell us what sort of parties we may attend, and at what times, and how often in a month; nor whether we shall vote, or, if so, with what party. These *applications* of New Testament principles must be made in the exercise of our best judgment, under a sense of our accountability to God.

2. It refers to *rash swearing*—to an oath rashly uttered to do something or other (the phrase "to do evil or to do good" being a general phrase to denote an oath in respect to anything), and afterwards forgotten. When it is brought to his mind, he is to acknowledge his sin in neglecting the fulfillment of his oath, or in making an oath he had no right to make.

Scriptures, Protestant vs. Romish View. In what sense do Protestants affirm and Romanists deny that the Scriptures form a complete and infallible rule of faith and practice?

INQUIRER.

In the sense (1) that they contain all that God has authoritatively taught; (2) that nothing is to come beween the Scriptures and the individual conscience in the way of authority. Romanists hold that much is

taught by tradition of equal authority with the Scriptures; and that the church (now the Pope) is the authoritative and infallible expounder of Scripture and tradition.

Secrecy, Why Enjoined. Why was secrecy enjoined upon the disciples in so many instances of the exhibition of Christ's miraculous power, as on the occasion of his transfiguration, etc.?

For various reasons; just as, under different circumstances, he said, "Go and publish what great things the Lord hath done for thee."

In the case referred to by our querist, as the time for Jesus to enter on his authority, and Moses to retire, was not until after his resurrection, there was wisdom in concealing it from the multitude until then. In some cases, near Jerusalem, when the rulers would have been aroused against him, he desired to avoid publicity. In other cases where a half-heathen multitude were all agape about the mere miracle, he desired to avoid ministering to their mere love of curiosity. But, in general, his course was the fulfillment of the prophecy, "He shall not lift up his voice, nor cry," etc.—indicating that his ministry would rest on its intrinsic merits, and not on ostentatious display.

Sectarianism, Its Benefit. Was not sectarianism beneficial to Christianity, inasmuch as it gave rise to the Reformation of the sixteenth century?

Sectarianism did not give rise to the Reformation; it arose from a knowledge of, and reverence for, the word of God. Sectarianism came in and marred the work and hindered its full development. What the Lutheran Reformation has been, in the way of blessing, it has been in spite of sectarianism, and it would have been much richer in blessings if it had not degenerated into sectarianism. Because Protestantism, with all of sectarianism that has clung to it, has been superior to

Roman Catholicism, it does not surely follow that a complete return to the simplicity, integrity, spirituality and catholicity of the New Testament churches would not be superior to Protestantism.

Because nations, with an increase of wealth and power, have become corrupt, it does not follow that we should abolish nations and have only clans or tribes; but rather that, heeding the lessons of the past, we should seek to guard nations against corrupting influences and tendencies.

Because sects, in spite of their secthood, have done good, it does not follow that sects are desirable; any more than it follows that because God causes the wrath of man to praise him, men should abandon themselves to wrath. God causes them to praise him in spite of their wrath; and he causes sects to praise him in spite of their secthood; but neither wrath nor sectism can therefore be accepted as praiseworthy.

Sick, Healing of. Much has been said in this neighborhood lately about the faithful praying and laying hands on the sick, causing the sick to recover; and in reference to other miracles our friends quote some Scripture, to prove that if we are faithful we can work miracles in this age and generation, just as well as the apostles in their day. We would be thankful for your opinion, backed by Scripture. Do you believe this an age of miracles, or no?

If you are a Methodist, we presume you believe that miracles are now wrought; for we take it that, in the Methodist view, every conversion is a miracle. It is wrought by an immediate and supernatural exercise of divine power, and the sinner is assured *by a direct revelation to his own soul* that his sins are forgiven. If we believed this, we would not find it difficult to believe that miracles are wrought also on the *bodies* of men. We

incline to the opinion that the notion now prevailing in some quarters concerning miracles of healing grows out of the prevailing doctrine that regeneration is a miracle and the assurance of pardon a direct revelation to the sinner.

But to come directly to your question. We see nothing in the way of the exercise of miraculous power now, any more than in any preceding age, if God sees proper to exercise it. But we can not say that we look upon modern miracles as genuine, although we doubt not that some genuine cures are reported, and that many pious persons are sincere in their belief of their miraculous character.

1. We regard the healings referred to in Jas. 5:13, as a special class of cases—perhaps cases of disease divinely inflicted, like those referred to in 1 Cor. 11:30. The promise of cure was *positive* in these cases, and does not allow of the failures that attend modern performances.

2. Outside of these special cases, the miraculous gifts of the apostolic age were not limited to the healing of diseases, but extended to speaking unknown languages, prophesying, rendering harmless the bite of serpents, giving sight to the blind, and even raising the dead. If there is a return of that power, we don't see why it is limited in its exercise to the healing of certain diseases, and why even then it is an utter failure in so many instances.

3. These modern miracles are wrought with equal facility by believers and unbelievers, the advocates of false religions and of no religion. Roman Catholics have cases as well attested as any. Mormons, Spiritualists, Adventists, orthodox and heterodox parties—all lay claim to this power, and use it as a confirmation of the

truth of their teachings. There is something wrong—a screw loose somewhere, if not several screws.

4. Such is the power of the human will, of imagination and of sympathy, that out of a given number of cases of disease a certain proportion may be safely counted on as capable of cure by appeal to these forces. Add to these the cases of fraud and imposture, and there will not be left a larger number of remarkable cases than belonged to past times, when no miraculous power was claimed.

We do not, therefore, put faith in modern miracles. They are too limited, variable, uncertain, and are the seals of too many doctrines, to commend themselves to our judgment as genuine.

As to the cessation of miracles, see 1 Cor. 13:8.

Signs Accompanied Believers. Please explain Mark 16:17, 18. I know one minister who argues that, if "these signs" do not *now* follow "them that believe," it is because said believers have not the amount of faith which they might have.

Also another, who argues that "these signs" would *now* "follow them that believe," if said believers were placed in like circumstances, which circumstances may *now,* and *do now,* occur; and, further, that God, in answer to prayer, *does now* empower believers in Christ to work miracles.

Did miracles cease with the apostolic age? An answer through your paper will oblige.

The signs *did* follow believers until the object of the signs was accomplished. It was their purpose to *confirm, establish* the Word preached. This they did. A message once fully confirmed or established is confirmed or established forever, and does not need to have the confirmation constantly repeated. The truth confirmed remains, but the *evidence* ceases when enough has been given. That miracles were to cease, see 1 Cor. 13:8; Eph. 4:11-16.

Sins Going Before. Will you be so kind as to give an explanation of 1 Tim. 5:24, 25, to-wit: "Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment, and some men they follow after"?

Paul had been instructing Timothy to be careful in appointing men to office (v. 23) lest he should be a partaker of other men's sins by carelessly admitting unworthy persons to the ministry. As an additional caution alike against hasty approval and hasty condemnation, he tells him that some men's sins are evident, notorious, so that the report of them will come to him before the man himself appears to have his case passed on; while other subtle, sly sinners are not readily known in their true character, and their sins will not be openly manifest until after the decision he is called to make. So, likewise, some good men's characters are open and known to all, while in other cases men of real merit are misjudged and their character is longer in being established beyond dispute. He must not, therefore, hastily approve or condemn—not be content with a mere surface view of men's characters, but exercise deliberation and penetration before he reaches his conclusions.

Soul-sleeping, Do We Teach? If a man publicly or privately claims that as a people we teach or tolerate the soul-sleeping heresy, and persists in so teaching, is he worthy of the confidence of the churches, or ought he to be countenanced and endorsed by our brotherhood?

If any one so represents us, he is mistaken, and should be corrected. Such teaching has always had disastrous results in our ranks; and while our brethren generally desire not to interfere with any one's opinions, or to break fellowship with any one on account of his opinions, they make a very broad distinction between one's private opinions, and the *teaching* of such opinions

as any part of the doctrine of Christ. Against the latter they are firmly set.

Soul vs. Spirit. 1. What may we understand of the "soul, body and spirit" (1 Thess. 5:23)?

2. Is not the term "soul" used in the Scriptures to convey different ideas?

3. What may we understand by the term "heart" as used in the Scriptures? For example, "With the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness."

4. What did the ancient Greeks and Hebrews understand by this term?

5. Are there not some nations of people who locate the affections in the liver and some in the bowels?

1. Confining our answer within the space to which we are limited in this department, we can not do better than to transcribe the condensed statements of some eminent critics.

Alford says: "*Pneuma* is the spirit, the highest and distinctive part of man, the immortal and responsible *soul,* in our common parlance. *Psuke* is the lower or animal soul, containing the passions and desires which we have in common with the brutes, but which in *us* is ennobled and drawn up by the *pneuma.* The spirit, that part whereby we are receptive of the Holy Spirit of God, is, in the unspiritual man, crushed down and subordinated to the animal soul (*psuke*): he therefore is called *psukikos.*"

Dr. John Lillie, in Lange, says: "It may be remarked that we frequently find instances of an apparent dichotomy, as 'body and soul' (Matt. 6:25; 10:28); or 'body and spirit' (1 Cor. 5:3; 7:34); but such passages will only be found accommodations to the popular division into a material and immaterial part; the *psuke,* in the former of the exceptional cases, including also the *pneuma,*

just as, in the latter case, the *pneuma* also comprehends the *psuke*."

R. Milligan, on Heb. 4:13, says: "From the days of Pythagoras (500 B. C.), more especially from the time of Plato (350 B. C.), the doctrine of the trinity in human nature became somewhat prevalent. These philosophers both taught, in substance, that man consists of a material body (*soma*), an animal soul (*psuke*), and an immortal spirit (*pneuma*). The soul was by them regarded as the seat of animal life, together with its several instincts, passions and appetites; and the spirit was supposed to be the seat of the higher intellectual and moral faculties. In this sense, Paul manifestly uses these terms both in our text and also in 1 Thess. 5:23. But whether he aims here to speak of man as he really is, or merely to use by way of accommodation the current phraseology of the Greeks, is not so clear."

In our judgment, there is no good reason to suspect the apostle of lending countenance to a mere philosophical speculation.

We must be careful, however, not to make too much out of this distinction. In 1 Thess. 5:23, as also in Heb. 4:12, the distinction is not that of constituent parts or substances, but that of *relations, sides, functions* of the same essence, according to its upward or downward direction. *Pneuma* is the spiritual nature in its Godward direction and exercise; whereas *psuke* is the spiritual nature on the animal side—the quickening power of the body, as in animals. It is very skillful dissection that divides asunder the soul and spirit (Heb. 4:12).

2. Yes. As, for instance, the spiritual nature in opposition to the animal (Matt. 10:28); the animal life (Lev. 17:11—the life or soul of the flesh is in the blood); the whole person (Gen. 12:5); the life of man (Ps. 33:19);

and again for desire or affection (1 Sam. 18:1; Prov. 27:7). The connection will generally determine the meaning.

3. Its meaning is various. It denotes *the understanding* (Matt. 13:15). Courage (1 Sam. 17:32). Quick perception, prudence (Hos. 7:11). Slow of heart is slow to perceive and understand (Luke 24:25). Want of memory and reflection is want of heart (Jer. 12:11). Imagination, inclination, affection (Ezek. 13:2). When used as distinct from mind, it refers to the moral nature or the affections (Matt. 22:37); but it frequently covers the whole intellectual and moral nature, as in Matt. 15:19, and in the text quoted by our querist, and Luke 6:45; 8:15; 9:47; Heb. 4:12; Eph. 4:18; Rom. 10:9, and numerous other passages. The word has a variety of meanings now, as may be seen by referring to Webster.

4. It was used to denote, primarily, the seat of life; then, metaphorically, the seat of desire, passion, impulse; then of courage, of joy and sorrow; and it came to mean, too, the seat of *thought*. It was used also to denote the stomach. Also, the inner part, middle, center.

There is no need to go beyond the Bible for proof that the bowels were used to represent the affections and sympathies. See 2 Cor. 6:12; Phil. 1:18; 2:1; Col. 3:12; Philem. 7, 12, 20; 1 John 3:17. Indeed, the word *heart* came largely to supplant the word *bowels* as representative of the sympathies and affections, and there is as much sense in locating conversion in the bowels as in the heart, if by heart we mean the muscular organization that is known by that name.

Sunday-school, Who Should Teach? Should a Sunday-school superintendent permit *unconverted persons* to teach in the Sunday-school?

Is it not a strange and incongruous thing for those who have

never known the love of Christ to attempt to teach his word to the young—even to young Christians who have obeyed him, and who need to learn from those who are filled with a knowledge of his love?

If the *sole object* of the Sunday-school is to convert the children, or if by "unconverted persons" the querist means the unbelieving, the wicked or profane, then we must answer decidedly in the negative. But there are many persons "not far from the kingdom of God," whose education and sympathies are all in favor of the gospel, who are capable of teaching some of the classes, and to whom this Sunday-school work is a means of leading themselves to a full consecration to Christ. We would not say of such that they ought not to teach—at least, until a sufficient number of converted persons, their equals in other respects, are prepared to take their places. It is to the dishonor of many professedly converted persons that these unconverted ones outstrip them in devotion to Sunday-school work. Do not drive them away. Give them work that they can do; throw around them saving influences, and make it a special object to win them fully to Christ. But those who are irreligious and unbelieving clearly have no place as teachers in the Sunday-school.

R. **Sunday-schools, Relation to Church.** Supposing the Sunday-school to be at least approved by the Scriptures, what are the relations of the church to it (1) as a fact; (2) as to spiritual and moral obligation; (3) as to financial support? By giving the above questions a careful consideration, you will confer a favor.

1. It is simply an agency of the church for the instruction of the ignorant, especially of the young. It is one of the means of fulfilling the great commission to disciple the nations and teach them to observe the commandments of Christ—a means especially adapted to the

capacities and needs of children. It is one of the means, approved by experience, of "holding forth the word of life."

2. The same as to any other agency or means adopted by the church to fulfill its mission—the obligation of a parent to its offspring, of a creator to its creation—the obligation to nourish the life it has called into existence, to sustain the agency of its own creation or adoption.

3. If financial support is necessary, there is the same obligation to render this as any other kind of support. Whatever is needful for the successful accomplishment of Sunday-school work, the church should feel under obligations to provide to the full extent of its ability.

There is only one way for the church to escape this obligation—that is, to repudiate the Sunday-school as no part of her appointment for the salvation of sinners.

Supper, the Lord's—How to be Observed. I write asking information. We have in this congregation several persons who are faithful workers, ever ready to aid in every good work, but there is an unusual reverence for the Lord's Supper. They fear to take lest they "eat and drink condemnation." Any advice you may give on this subject will be very thankfully received.

Such scruples should be tenderly handled, but, generally, they are founded in a mistaken view of the Lord's Supper.

1. It *is* a solemn institution, and should be observed only with solemnity and reverence. But so is *prayer* a solemn thing. Can we conceive anything more deeply solemn than a personal approach to Deity, and a personal address to the infinitely holy One? Certainly it is sinful to engage in prayer in a spirit of levity; but must we refuse to pray because we are painfully conscious of our unworthiness? On the contrary, special encouragement

is given to such to pray; for the Lord promises to "dwell with him who is of a poor and a contrite spirit, and who trembleth at my word." So, also, it would be improper to come to the Lord's Supper in an irreverent or thoughtless or impenitent spirit, while living in sin and not even intending to forsake it; but such a condition of soul *will cut us off from all acceptable worship or service,* as well as from the Lord's Supper. But a painful consciousness of unworthiness is the very spirit in which we ought to come to the Supper; for only in such a frame of mind can we properly appreciate the divine mercy and love which are there set forth.

2. The instructions in 1 Corinthians 11 are often misunderstood. The Corinthians turned the Lord's Supper into a feast and an exhibition of party affinities, so that its *design*—to show forth the Lord's death—was frustrated. *This* is what Paul calls "eating and drinking unworthily," and against *this* he warns them. "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." He therefore calls on every man to "examine himself" as to the objects before him—whether to indulge in a feast or a carousal, or to show forth the death of the Lord. Nor does he say, "Examine yourself, and not eat and drink;" but, "Examine yourself, and *so* eat and drink"—that is, so eat and drink as to show forth the Lord's death; for he adds, "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, *if he discern not the body.*" It was with regard to the *manner* of observance that this was written, and not to discourage any soul oppressed with a sense of personal unworthiness from coming to the Lord's table.

Reflect, that a condition of soul that would properly

hinder you from coming to the Lord's table, will also hinder your prayers, and render unacceptable all your worship and all your offerings. If you can work and sing and pray and give, without scruple, you can also come to the Lord's table without scruple. The Lord loves to be thus *remembered*, and it honors him before the world to show forth his redeeming love in this way. And it *dishonors* him when we fail to keep our place among those who thus proclaim their trust in his grace.

Surety for Christians. A and B are members of the church. A gives to B a note for a certain sum of money. He gives as security a man not a church-member. The note becomes due. A says he can not pay it now, but will as soon as he can. Now, B wants the money, and knows that A can not pay it, but believes the security good. A has no property, but security has. Security may put his property out of B's reach very soon. Now, do you think B would violate both the letter and spirit of the law laid down in 1 Cor. 6: 1-8, by suing? How should the church deal with the parties if suit is brought on the note, if anything at all?

We do not see that the church has anything to do with it. There is no good reason for a dispute in the case. It is a plain business transaction in which one who is not a church-member is responsible for the payment of the note, and no one can justly blame A for holding him responsible, especially if there is reason to believe that leniency will only lead the endorser to put his property out of A's reach. What could a church decide in such a case? That A shall release his security, and lose his money? But the church has nothing to do with the relation existing between A and the endorser. Will they decide that B must pay the money? But he can not pay it, only through his endorser; and this leaves A to do at last what he had a perfect right to do at first. B can

certainly enter no just complaint against A for doing just what he arranged to have him do in such a contingency. There must be shown some unusual reason for leniency on A's part, before he is asked to refrain from enforcing his just demand.

Tobacco Chewing vs. Smoking. Is it more impolite or unchristian for Sister B to smoke during religious services than for Bro. A to chew his cud or quid, and squirt his black red tobacco juice in great puddles on the meeting-house floor, so that ladies must step over as they would over a filthy mudhole?

We think not. No one, either in a public assembly or a private gathering, has a right to annoy others, or inflict injury on them, by a practice for which there is no better plea than self-gratification. He may have a right, so far as human relations are concerned, to indulge his own desires, even if such indulgence is hurtful to himself, so long as he does not injure others by it. But when a man comes into society, he is bound to recognize the rights of others, and to sacrifice his own wishes in so far as they war against the peace or happiness of others. This is especially true in Christian associations. It ought to be treated as a grave offense against decency and good neighborhood to act in the way described by our querist.

Trinity, In the Name of. In laying the corner-stone of a Presbyterian church of this place, this expression was used: "In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, we lay this corner-stone." Is it right thus to use the sacred name? My sense of propriety was shocked by it.

There is no authority for such usage. The religious teachers of the age seem strangely ignorant of the fact that this formula is associated in the Scriptures only with the baptism of the believer, because it was the divinely appointed induction *into* new relationships to the Godhead—Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is now about

universally conceded that the proper rendering is "*into* the name of the Father," etc. How can a corner-stone be laid *into* the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit? It is absurd.

Unclean Spirits. 1. Were the unclean spirits spoken of in Mark 5, and elsewhere, visible, tangible beings?

2. Did the granting of their request by the Saviour (Mark 5:13) imply that those demons had any power of persuasion over him?

3. Of what is the entire circumstance significant? I know it demonstrated the power of Christ, but does it not also convey some practical lesson? What application may at present be made of it?

4. What is the significance of the circumstance recorded in Matt. 12:43-45?

1. We have no intimation that they were visible to the natural eye. There is much in the universe, great and small, not at present visible to us. See 2 Kings 7:13-17.

2. Not any more than the granting of Satan's request implied that he had power of persuasion with Jehovah (Job 1:6-12). It simply shows that they can do nothing only as divinely permitted, and that such permission grows not out of any persuasive power on their part, but out of the higher considerations of the best welfare of man and the glory of God. Such permission is only given when it will work grand results.

3. Yes; it conveys the practical lesson that those who are under the protection of Christ are free from the horrid demonism of evil spirits, since they can only act with his permission.

4. Its significance, as used by our Lord, is to illustrate the condition of the Jewish nation at that time. Its general significance is that when one is delivered from the dominion of evil, he must carefully guard against its efforts to re-establish itself. In the antagonism between

the false and the true, whether in *beings* or in *principles,* the conflict goes ceaselessly on. Defeat is not necessarily overthrow. Extirpation is not annihilation. Evil will seek a return to its old seat of empire, and if we yield to its seductions, its second reign is worse than its first. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Union, Is It Desirable? Would not the church, if united, become corrupt as did the Catholics?

That depends. A union effected from carnal or selfish motives must necessarily issue in corruption. But a *union* springing from *unity* of faith and spirit—from oneness with Jesus in spirit and life—need not be corrupting, and will not be while the members hold to Christ. The fact that corruptions have prevailed in the past may and ought to be our safeguard for the future—history pointing out to us the rocks on which Christians in former times were wrecked.

Usury, When Wrong. 1. Is it right to require *interest* from a brother who is in distress?

2. Is it right for an elder of the church to sue a brother and by law take from him all his property and leave his family destitute and in distress?

3. Should an elder who would be guilty of that, and who, being abundantly able, should refuse his brother's appeal for help, be permitted to stand before the congregation and minister to them in holy things?

1. This is an important question, and requires care and discrimination in the application of the Scriptures that relate to it.

(1) *Usury*, in the Scriptures, does not mean *an exorbitant rate* of interest, but simply *interest.* The word *usury* is derived from a verb meaning *to bite,* and carries with it an intimation of the sentiment anciently prevailing as to the greed or cruelty, or both, involved in exact-

ing interest on money loaned. This sentiment, however, with the growth of commerce and manufactures, and the demand for money, has entirely changed; and now, to pay for the use of money is regarded as just as to pay for the use of a house or land or anything else belonging to another which we want to use. The tendency, however, to an oppressive selfishness in the price exacted for the use of money has led Christian nations generally to fix the rate of interest; and *usury,* in the modern sense is the exaction of a higher price for the use of money than the law allows. Let it be carefully noted, however, that in the Scriptures *any* price exacted for the use of money is *usury.*

(2) Let us look at Scripture teaching on this question.

"If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury" (Ex. 22:25).

"Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother, usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury. Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury, but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand unto, in the land whither thou goest to possess it" (Deut. 23:19, 20).

From the foregoing it appears that, among the Jews, they were not, *under any circumstances,* to exact interest on money loaned to a brother Jew, whether he was poor and in distress or not. But they might exact interest of strangers. This would go to show that even in that early day, when the business interests of the world made no such demands for the use of money as at present, it was allowable for Jews to require interest on loans made to any outside their own nation. This shows that it was

not held to be a sin *per se* to exact a price for the use of money, and the reason of the prohibition of interest among the Jews in lending to their own people must be sought in something else than the intrinsic wrong of usury. This will be more apparent from another passage in the Jewish law:

"If thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen into decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him; yea, *though he be a stranger,* or *a sojourner,* that he may live with thee. *Take thou no usury of him, or increase,* but fear thy God, that thy brother may live with thee. *Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury,* nor lend him thy victuals for increase" (Lev. 25: 35-37).

It will be seen that they were forbidden to take usury or interest even from a stranger, when he was in poverty and distress. This makes a clear distinction between a fair price for money loaned to a Gentile when he was able to pay it, and exacting the price when he was in distress—showing that the sin was not in taking interest for money loaned, but in exacting it or extorting it when he was in necessitous circumstances. The latter was always and only a sin, whether the money was loaned to Jew or Gentile.

We are aware that Murphy and others give another translation of this passage, and make it say that the brother who has waxed poor shall be as a stranger, or sojourner—that is, though without land, he shall not be oppressed. But this is rather a gloss than a translation.

We are not able to speak positively as to the reason why interest was never to be exacted from a Jew by his brother. Our opinion is that, as they were largely an agricultural people, and it was designed to preserve them as a separate people, it was meant to discourage the loaning of money on any large scale, lest they should be

tempted to embark in commercial and other enterprises, and mingle with other nations, and thus lose their separate character. In Solomon's reign they did venture in this way, and the subsequent history shows that it was not for their good. The best way to prevent this was to forbid the taking of interest, for those possessing money would then be sure not to lend except in cases where the law absolutely required it—that is, to those in poverty and distress (Deut. 15:7-11).

(3) The taking of usury was always severely condemned by the Jewish prophets. See Ps. 15:5; Prov. 28:8; Neh. 5:1-13; Ezek. 18:8, 13, 17; 22:12.

(4) In the New Testament we have no special regulations on this matter, and it becomes a question of casuistry. We must seek out the principles of justice and brotherly love, and apply them.

Our own conclusions are as follows: *a.* As the taking of interest is not a sin *per se,* and as the special considerations that gave rise to the Jewish prohibition of usury among brethren were special and not general, we conclude that since money has become so generally an article of commerce, and loans are so necessary to the carrying on of the business of the world, it is right to demand and to receive a just compensation for the use of money, just as for the use of a horse or a house or a farm. Nor is there any good reason known to us why a Christian, in borrowing from his brother, with a view to benefit himself by the use of his brother's money, should not pay a just price for the use of it, just the same as if he rented his house or his cow or his farm.

b. If the borrower, however, comes in distress to seek relief at the hands of his brother, and his brother has it in his power to help him, every consideration of Christian benevolence would dictate that no advantage should

be taken of the necessities of a worthy man, either to exact exorbitant interest or to require even legal interest of one who is unable to pay it. The Christian law of love is surely not less benevolent or merciful than the Jewish law. *If he is able to grant him relief,* he should not only do so, but feel that in what he does to the least of Christ's disciples he does unto him.

c. If one Christian has borrowed money of another, and is so unfortunate in his business transactions that he can not pay back the principal with interest without stripping himself of all his means of living, his creditor should not oppress him; he *dare not,* if he expects mercy from God (Jas. 2:13). But it does not follow that the creditor is bound to release all the interest, or any part of the principal. Whether he is thus bound or not depends on circumstances. *If he is able* to grant such release, the law of Christian love, which teaches us to make our brother's case our own (Heb. 13:3), requires him to do so; and the law of humanity (thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself) requires him not to oppress any may not be able to grant such a release. Here, for instance, is a Christian man who decides, in place of putting his money into some business enterprise, to make that money an article of trade, and to live upon the income derived from his loans. This is legitimate. He accordingly loans his money at a fair rate of interest, and arranges to live on his income. On this basis he makes his purchases and gives his promises to pay. It requires all that is due to him to feed his family and fulfill his promises; and he can not release any of his debtors from their obligations without breaking his own promises and debtor, whether he is a Christian brother or not. But he doing wrong to those who have trusted him. On what principle of right is he required to give up what is justly

due to him, and to assist another at the expense of his own family or his own creditors? If you rent his house for a year, and at the end of the year say, "I have been unfortunate, and am not able to pay any rent; I give you back your house—that is all you are entitled to receive from me;" is that just? Quite as much so as in the case of renting money. If he is able to remit the rent, he is bound as a Christian to deal benevolently with you, and dare not oppress you without forfeiting his own claim on the mercy of God; but if he is dependent on the rent justly due to him to meet his own obligations, and to provide things honest in the sight of all men, he is *not* bound to release you. *Your claim for help, under these circumstances, is no more a claim against him than against all your brethren.* Those of them who are able should come to your relief, and he along with the rest to the extent of his ability—and no further. So, in our judgment, the answer to the first question must depend on the facts in any particular case.

2. To this question we answer decidedly *no;* unless by failing to urge his claim he is likely to bring similar distress upon his own family. There should be patient waiting; or an effort should be made, especially if the debtor is a worthy Christian man, to induce brethren who are able to come to his help and spare the necessity of such a proceeding. We should dread to take the responsibility of such a proceeding, unless, as already intimated, a failure to sue would involve us in a similar distress, and our own obligations to others absolutely demanded such a proceeding.

3. If he is "abundantly able" to relieve his brother in distress, and yet heartlessly drives him to the wall because the law gives him the power to do so, he is not only unfit to occupy the place of a ruler and teacher in the

church, but even to hold membership in the church. There are few sins for which there should be less tolerance. But the case must be clearly made out as one of deliberate and determined oppression of a brother in distress by one who was abundantly able to exercise mercy towards him.

Water, Clean, Sprinkled. Please explain Ezek. 26:25-27. Also Zech. 8:23.

The previous verses tell of the Jews being carried captive into heathen countries. Verse 24 tells of their restoration. Verse 25 says: "*Then* will I sprinkle clean water upon you," etc. Consult Numbers 19, and you will see that one who contracted legal uncleanness by touching a dead body, or going into a tent where a dead body was found, or touching a bone or a grave, was required to have the water of separation (water poured on the ashes of a burnt red heifer) sprinkled on him on the third day and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he was to bathe his body in water, in order to be cleansed. These Jews, returning from captivity, were all regarded, from their long residence among the heathen, as unclean, and they had to be cleansed according to the law recorded in Numbers 19. It has nothing whatever to do with Christian baptism.

The "new heart" spoken of was a heart weaned from the idolatries and sins on account of which they had been sent into captivity. That it has no reference to what we call conversion to Christ, may be readily seen by reading verses 28 to the close of the chapter. The blessings promised to the new heart were not salvation from sin and eternal life, but corn, fruit and safe dwelling in their own land. Any one who applies this to the gospel dispensation is sadly wanting in discrimination.

Zechariah returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. His prophecies relate largely to the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of prosperity to the nation so long oppressed. The eighth chapter is an encouragement to the Jews to proceed with the work of restoring Jerusalem, assured that it would yet be re-established in prosperity, and the nation attain to new importance in the eyes of other nations. Taking hold of the skirt is an entreaty for assistance and protection. This nation, so helpless and despised, should yet be appealed to by other nations for assistance. We presume it is not necessary to go beyond the history of the Jews under the second temple to find the fulfillment of this—but if any prefer to find its realization in later times, we have no controversy with them.

Water Made Wine. A brother denies that water was made wine at Cana; says that Paul had no reference to physical infirmities when he said to Timothy, "Drink no longer water." He affirms that the miracle was wrought on the governor, and that Paul condemned Timothy's vacillation of character, and exhorted him to courage and steadfastness in language alluded to. What think you?

The ground has been taken by some learned men—Lange, we believe, for one, in his "Life of Jesus"—that the miracle was wrought on the governor. But, 1. It is distinctly stated that the "water was made into wine" (v. 9). 2. It is a second time distinctly stated that Jesus "made the water into wine" (chap. 4:46). 3. It is distinctly announced as a "miracle;" but this interpretation would reduce it to a mere experiment in biology. 4. The miracle was performed not in behalf of the governor, but of the whole company. 5. It is as much anti-temperance to tickle the passion of a mere wine-drinker by a biological experiment as to give him genuine wine. Bet-

ter to say that it was wine without any intoxicating qualities. 6. There is no assertion of any miracle wrought on the governor, but on the water. 7. We do not understand what is meant by making the passage in Timothy relate to Timothy's *spiritual* stomach. The language is as plain as language can be, and we take it that stomach means stomach, wine means wine and water means water. We see not the shadow of a reason for forcing a figurative interpretation on this very plain piece of advice.

Williams, Roger. Will you please state when Roger Williams commenced building the Baptist Church, and in what year?

In March, 1639, Ezekiel Holliman baptized Roger Williams, and Williams baptized Holliman and some ten others. Thus was started the first Baptist church in America. But Williams did not long continue in that church.

Wine, Communion. 1. Is it wrong to use strong wine in the Lord's Supper?

2. If so, how can we precure and keep pure the simple unfermented juice of the grape?

3. If we can not procure the second, and it is wrong to use the first, what will we do?

1. "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean" (Rom. 14:14). For ourself, we have no scruples about the use of fermented wine at the Lord's Supper, and we can not but regard the notions of some of our temperance advocates on this point as extreme. But wherever such scruples can be met without a surrender of divine authority, it ought to be done. The use of *wine* in the Supper is taught—whether fermented or unfermented, is an inference. If any conscientiously object to fermented

wine, their scruples can be respected by others without a surrender of conscience.

2. We take the following from the *Northwestern Christian Advocate,* communicated by Wm. Allman, of Sturgis, Mich.:

> Mrs. Allman prepares it in three ways. 1. By boiling her grapes, same as any other fruit, in the usual way. Strain out the liquid when wanted for use. 2. By boiling the grapes, strain out the liquid juice, and add an equal amount of sugar. Boil the mixture for a few moments until very thick, then can, same as by first method. 3. By making regular jelly, which all women know how to make. The first is the cheapest and easiest, but not so sure. It is more liable to ferment, sour and spoil. We use the first method during the earlier part of the year. The second is more sure and reliable. We have some on hand made years ago. When wanted for use, we have but to dilute with water and sweeten to suit the taste. Mrs. Allman prefers the second method as the most reliable. Jelly will dry up, and is not so easily prepared as by either of the other methods. The editor of the *Northwestern* adds: "Singularly enough, these methods are as old as Pliny and Columella. The ancients prevented fermentation by permanently depressing the grape pulp below forty-five degrees, by raising the temperature above seventy-five degrees, and by straining." Any church can supply itself by Mrs. Allman's method.

3. This has no force, in view of answer to Question 2.

Witnesses, Qualifications of. What qualifications are absolutely essential to entitle a witness to credence?

1. *Competency* and *credibility* are the qualifications without which a witness is unfit to testify. To competency belongs the *legal* right to testify—that is, according to law, having the capacity to testify. A blind man is incompetent to testify where color is the object of testimony; a deaf man, where sound is the object of testimony. Hence competency embraces all objects of *sense,* or apprehended by sense. If an object of sight, the wit-

ness must have seen it himself; if of sound, he must have heard it himself. And so of all the senses. This is the rule in all courts where natural phenomena alone are investigated. But where supernatural phenomena are under consideration, the witness must have a competency homogeneous with the proposition to which he can be a competent witness; that is, he must have *credentials* such as will lift him into the arena where he has a legal right to testify—such as that referred to by Jesus Christ (John 10: 37): "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not;" or that referred to by Peter and John in the temple (Acts 4): "Then Peter, full of the Holy Spirit, said to them," etc.; or that referred to by Moses, when he came before Pharaoh—the rod turning to a serpent, the leprous hand and the water turning to blood. These two classes of qualifications exhaust the demands of competency. No man, therefore, can be a witness to a supernatural fact or proposition without such credentials. And *these credentials must be open to the inspection of those to whom or before whom the testimony is given.* This testimony, thus given, *confirmed and entered on record,* becomes for all time the highest possible testimony.

2. Credibility. This quality refers to the *veracity* of the witness. A credible person is one of known veracity or integrity, or whose veracity may be fairly adduced from circumstances (*Webster*). That which may be believed worthy of credit. A thing is credible when it is known to be possible; or when it involves no contradiction or absurdity. It is more credible when it is known to come within the ordinary operations of nature. The power of working miracles is essential to credibility, where a supernatural proposition is to be proved. The possession of such credentials proves the person posses-

sing them worthy of credit, and therefore credible. These two qualities exhaust the law of credibility, or meet its highest demands. The testimony of such witnesses becomes irrefragable, or conclusive in the highest degree, and fills up the measure of the highest demands of truth. And hence a proposition sustained by such testimony is absolute, and in harmony with all other truth in the universe, or what is called essential truth, and contains in itself the eight *criteria* essential to conclusive testimony, to-wit:

1. The nature or character of the witnesses—not too high, not too low—beyond impeachment.

2. The number of the witnesses. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established," is an oracle alike of reason, law and revelation.

3. Agreement of the witnesses. There must be no contradiction. It devolves on the adverse party to show the contradiction.

4. The time of giving the testimony. The testimony must be given while the facts are all fresh in the minds of all concerned—especially so that the adverse parties can avail themselves of all the opposition they are entitled to.

5. The testimony must be given at the right place, where all the facts, in regard to the matter under consideration, transpired. The testimony must be given where the facts were accomplished.

6. The testimony must be given before the proper tribunal. The tribunal must not be made up of friends. A proper tribunal must be impartial. But where testimony forces the consent of enemies, it then reaches the highest possible point of power.

7. The facts must all be sensible facts; that is, facts appreciable by the senses, things seen and heard. The

facts must have been addressed to one or more of the senses.

8. The motives of the witnesses. The witnesses must be above reasonable suspicion or honorable dispute.

Did the twelve apostles of Christ possess the essential qualifications of witnesses in relation to the divinity of Christ? W.

Yes. The testimony they gave was all on matters which they had seen or heard. His works were all done in their presence. The four testimonies on which he relied as proof of his mission were all given in their presence, or open to their inspection. They were as follows:

1. The testimony of John the Baptist, a witness chosen of God for this very purpose and supernaturally qualified for this very purpose.

2. The testimony of God at his baptism and the descent of the Holy Spirit were both given in their presence.

3. The works which He did in their presence were his credentials, or the ground upon which his claims were based. All these were consummated in his resurrection, and were continued through more than three years, affording the very highest means of conclusiveness.

4. The Scriptures of the Old Testament were open to their inspection, from which they could learn everything respecting his ancestry (according to the flesh)—the place of his birth, the time of his birth, his mission among men, his betrayal by his familiar friends, his silence before his accusers and judge, his death by crucifixion, the parting of his garments and casting lots upon his vesture. All these were matters of prophecy hundreds of years before they transpired.

To these four were added a fifth:

The supernatural endowments bestowed on them on the day of Pentecost fully qualified them. And being thus armed and equipped, their competency and credibility are put beyond a peradventure.

Word, Sincere Milk of. What does Peter mean by "the sincere milk of the word"? What is it?

Some of our readers may think this a trifling question, but to us it indicates more than ordinary reflection. The text is by no means clear, as will be seen from various translations:

Desire the spiritual guileless milk.—*Alford.*

Long for the spiritual, unadulterated milk.—*Bible Union.*

Earnestly desire the pure spiritual milk.—*Anderson.*

Earnestly desire the unadulterated milk of the Word. —*Macknight.*

For your reasons unadulterated milk eagerly crave. —*Rotheram.*

Desyre that reasonable mylke which is without corrupcion.—*Tyndall.*

Desire ye the mylke (not of the body, but of the soule) which is without disceate.—*Cranmer.*

There are two difficulties: 1. Whether *logikon* is to be rendered *rational* or *reasonable,* as in Rom. 12:1, or *the word,* as in the Common Version. 2. Whether *adolon* is to be translated *unadulterated,* thus placing this spiritual milk in contrast with the teachings of man, or *guileless,* in opposition to *guile* in the first verse, as indicating that it has no other purpose but to nourish the soul. Hence the differences in translations given above.

We like Anderson's translation rather better than any. It is called *rational* or *spiritual* milk to show that it does not refer to literal milk. It is called *pure,* or

without guile, to indicate its divine excellence in opposition to human teachings or adulterations of truth.

But what is this milk? It is that which nourishes—not only so, but specifically that which nourishes babes in Christ. It is, therefore, the simplest and plainest revelations of truth in the gospel, in contrast with meat, or profounder truth and more advanced lessons, such as only riper minds can grasp (see Heb. 5:12-14; 1 Cor. 3:1, 2).

Words, Idle. Please explain the phrase "idle words" as found in Matt. 12:36, and oblige.

Argos, translated *idle,* means, in the New Testament, idle, unemployed, unproductive. In the classics, it is used with reference to land untilled, money lying without interest, and a fallacy or an argument that yields no true result. For its New Testament use, see Matt. 20:3, 6; 1 Tim. 5:13; 2 Pet. 1:8, in which last instance it is translated *barren.*

Hence it means, primarily, idle, useless, unproductive words—words that are meant for no worthy end, convey no valuable meaning, are intended to minister to no useful object. Much more, then, will the Lord condemn malicious, false and wicked words.

Words are regarded as proceeding from the heart, and indicating its condition. Idle words indicate an empty, trifling heart, insensible to the claims of duty, indifferent to the claims of truth.

Witty words, merry words, words of fancy and of sentiment, are not necessarily idle words. They have their use, and may be lawfully employed.

The context here would suggest that *malicious* words were in our Lord's mind; but the term he employs is much more comprehensive. We should set a watch upon our lips.

Works, Dead. Please give an exposition of Heb. 6:1: "Repentance from dead works;" "Doctrine of baptisms." What are the dead works? What baptisms?

It depends on what we understand to be meant by "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ" in verse 1, or, literally, "the word of the beginning of Christ." The same in meaning, we take it, as "the first rudiments of the oracles of God," or, "the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God," in chap. 5:12.

If these refer to the rudimentary teachings of the Jewish Scriptures, and the exhortation of Paul to these Hebrews is to come away from these to the riper, deeper and higher teachings of the new covenant, then the different rudiments mentioned will be sought in the Old Testament oracles. But if the reference of Paul is to the rudimentary teaching of the gospel—the elementary teaching concerning faith, repentance, baptism, etc.—the first and simplest lessons of the gospel which these Hebrew Christians had learned—then the different rudiments mentioned will be sought in the New Testament. It is not easy to decide which of these is the correct view. It is certain that the phrase "oracles of God" is used in the New Testament with reference to the Old Testament Scriptures (Rom. 3:2). It is certain, too, that the Old Testament contained, in rudimentary form, the principles of the teachings of Christ—that the *beginning* of the utterance of these principles is found in these ancient oracles of God. Indeed, the leading proposition of this Epistle—that which is elaborated throughout its argumentative portion—is, that the same God who had formerly spoken through the Jewish prophets has now spoken through his Son; and therefore there can be no disagreement between the old and new revelations—the former presenting in rudimentary form what

is fully developed in the latter. It may be set down as certain, too, concerning the Hebrews to whom Paul wrote, that while they had accepted the gospel, they clung tenaciously to the Old Testament, and were not disposed to learn of Christ, except through these ancient oracles. There would be great point and force in Paul's exhortation to leave what they had learned from these oracles of God, and press on to riper attainments in the knowledge of divine things by the diligent attention to the Christian revelations.

There is, however, much force in the reasoning of those who regard Paul's words as referring to the first principles of the teaching of Christ as presented in the gospel. We are not ripe in our own judgment for a decision.

If the former view is taken, then the expression, "faith toward *God,*" rather than faith in *Christ,* has special fitness. "Repentance from dead works" must refer to the abandonment of all wicked deeds, which were sure to end in death. "Baptisms" refers to the various immersions under the law, which were only typical of better things under the gospel. "Laying on of hands" refers to the practice of laying hands on the heads of the appointed sacrificial victims, which had lost their significance now that the true sin-offering had been offered and accepted. And the "resurrection of the dead" and "eternal judgment," which were but dimly revealed in the Old Testament—though the *foundation* of these were there—could only be properly understood by going on to the perfection of knowledge in the oracles of the new covenant.

If the second view is taken, "repentance from dead works" will be better understood as meaning to renounce and turn from the works of the law, for the sake of

trusting in Christ, since trust in works of the law for justification must necessarily end in death. See Phil. 3:8, 9. "Faith toward God" must be construed as meaning the same as faith in Christ (1 Pet. 1:20, 21). *Baptisms,* plural, must be taken as referring not only to the initiating ordinances of the gospel, but also to the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which belonged to "the beginning of the word of Christ," and had its chief significance in its association with the beginning of the gospel among Jews and Gentiles, as the baptism in water has its chief significance in its association with the beginning of each individual Christian life. "The resurrection of the dead" had its foundation already laid in the resurrection of Christ, which they had believed in believing the gospel, and this resurrection has also laid the foundation of the teaching concerning "eternal judgment" (Acts 17:31; John 16:8-11).

We have never yet been able to reach an interpretation of this passage that we could regard as final. But the general lesson taught in the passage is not difficult to understand—that we should not rest in past attainments, but "*grow* in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Worship, Is Singing? 1. Is the singing an element of the worship, as the preaching, teaching and praying are elements?

2. Does its acceptability in any wise depend upon the moral character of the performers?

3. Could a choir composed wholly or in part of infidels, scoffers, unconverted Jews, variety actors, comic opera singers, or other irreligious characters, perform acceptable service in a Christian congregation?

1. Certainly. "Singing and making melody in your hearts *to the Lord.*" "Praising God." "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also;

I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

2. Yes, as much as that of any other part of worship. "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." "Let us have grace whereby we may worship him *acceptably,* with reverence and godly fear." "God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth."

3. No. Such performances are not worship. It were as sensible to ask an infidel or a scoffer to be the mouthpiece of the church in prayer as in song; for song has in it all the elements of prayer—petition, thanksgiving, adoration, intercession, etc. It is an awful mockery when such men are allowed to be the mouthpieces—the representatives—of the church in the worship of the living God.

R **Worship Should Benefit.** Should Christians use anything in worship that will not spiritually benefit them, or from which they can not draw spiritual help?

Certainly not. But it may be a dispute among Christians whether this or that will spiritually benefit them. Such a difference of opinion should never lead to division. If there is forbearance and patience, and no attempt to *force* a conclusion, it will be found that Christians will generally reach one conclusion in such matters, sooner or later. But if there are attempts to make a test of fellowship out of such opinions, it is sure to be resisted, and the breach will be made wider. Christian worship is essentially *spiritual,* and only that which promotes spiritual worship is admissible.

Scripture Texts

Genesis 1:3-5 111
Genesis 3:17 11
Genesis 4:22 21
Genesis 6:3 22
Genesis 14:19 111
Genesis 25:23 212
Genesis 29:30-31 212
Genesis 32:24-28 259
Exodus 17:14 97
Leviticus 5:4-5 292
Leviticus 11:32 45
Numbers 31:23 45
Deuteronomy 4:13 23
Joshua 24:2-15 11
2 Kings 5:14 43
2 Kings 7:13-17 307
Nehemiah 5:1-13 311
Job 19:23-24 96
Job 31:35 96
Job 19:26 282
Psalms 146:4 120
Psalms 146:5 120
Psalms 136:14-24 168
Psalms 15:5 311
Proverbs 9:7-8 136
Proverbs 28:8 311
Ecclesiastes 9:5-6-10 120
Isaiah 22:22 226
Isaiah 59:20-21 17
Jeremiah 18:1-10 130
Ezekiel 14:14-16-18-20 220
Ezekiel 18:8-13-17 311
Ezekiel 22:12 311

Ezekiel 26:25-27 314
Daniel 4:13 43
Joel 2:28-32 179
Joel 2:28-32 185
Joel 3:28-32 37
Zechariah 3:1-3 259
Zechariah 8:23 314
Malachi 4:1-3 120
Matthew 3:6 40
Matthew 3:11 35
Matthew 3:11 36
Matthew 3:11-12 32
Matthew 3:11-12 36
Matthew 5:32 247
Matthew 5:32 247
Matthew 5:16-18 153
Matthew 5:23-24 164
Matthew 5:17-20 200
Matthew 6:9-13 268
Matthew 6:24 212
Matthew 8:11-12 58
Matthew 8:11-12 77
Matthew 10:37 212
Matthew 10:28 233
Matthew 11:12 228
Matthew 12:36 322
Matthew 12:43-45 307
Matthew 15:19 301
Matthew 17:11-13 139
Matthew 18 141
Matthew 18 142
Matthew 18:15-17 164
Matthew 19:9 191
Matthew 19:14 54
Matthew 19:27-29 278
Matthew 20:3-6 322
Matthew 23:8-11 16
Matthew 25:34-40 243
Matthew 28:19 91
Matthew 28:19 264
Mark 1:5 281

Mark 1:8 36
Mark 1:9 40
Mark 1:15 281
Mark 1:15 282
Mark 4:8 44
Mark 5 307
Mark 7:3 44
Mark 7:3 45
Mark 10:11-12 247
Mark 10:14 54
Mark 16:11-14 46
Mark 16:17 46
Mark 16:20 46
Mark 16:15-16 180
Mark 16:15-16 190
Luke 3 36
Luke 4:17-21 217
Luke 6:45 301
Luke 7:8 160
Luke 8:15 301
Luke 9:47 301
Luke 11:2-4 268
Luke 11:38 44
Luke 11:38 46
Luke 12:47 225
Luke 14:24 212
Luke 16:16 231
Luke 16:18 191
Luke 16:18 247
Luke 24:27-44-47 134
Luke 24:47 288
John 1:14 140
John 1:18 124
John 1:33 36
John 3:36 146
John 3:5 190
John 3:1-5 278
John 7:39 185
John 9:41 225
John 13 156
John 14:16 185

John 15:24 225
John 16:23-24 269
John 17 269
John 18:31 124
John 19:7 124
Acts 1:5 32
Acts 1:5 36
Acts 1:21-22 20
Acts 2:1-2 185
Acts 2:10 36
Acts 2:10 37
Acts 2:1-21 185
Acts 2:16-21 179
Acts 2:37-38 178
Acts 2:38 32
Acts 2:38 181
Acts 2:38 281
Acts 2:38 287
Acts 2:44 91
Acts 2:47 160
Acts 2:48 41
Acts 4:32 91
Acts 4:38 180
Acts 5:4 91
Acts 5:14 160
Acts 6:6 17
Acts 6:7 147
Acts 8:12-17 100
Acts 8:14-20 39
Acts 9:17 39
Acts 10:38 217
Acts 10:44-46 185
Acts 10:47-48 32
Acts 10:48 32
Acts 11:1-18 179
Acts 12:5 268
Acts 13:1-2 17
Acts 13:48 159
Acts 14:23 172
Acts 14:23 173
Acts 14:27 75

Acts 15:2 160
Acts 15:7-9 226
Acts 15:9 147
Acts 15:9 187
Acts 15:9 188
Acts 15:17 100
Acts 15:26 154
Acts 16:3 83
Acts 16:31 281
Acts 19:1-7 16
Acts 20:37 229
Acts 21:18 95
Acts 22:10 160
Acts 22:28 86
Acts 28:23 160
Acts 34:37 91
Romans 1:11 39
Romans 2:6-16 225
Romans 2:7 208
Romans 2:14 128
Romans 2:14-15 225
Romans 2:17-22 58
Romans 3:25 16
Romans 5:1 143
Romans 5:1 144
Romans 5:1-5 180
Romans 5:2 147
Romans 5:16-17 12
Romans 5:18-19 12
Romans 6 48
Romans 6:4 207
Romans 6:6-16 225
Romans 6:17 135
Romans 7:7 256
Romans 8:15 184
Romans 8:19-21 115
Romans 8:26-27 183
Romans 8:29-30 160
Romans 9:10-12 212
Romans 9:20-21 130
Romans 10:8 147

Romans 10:9 301
Romans 11:25-27 19
Romans 11:25-32 211
Romans 12:7-8 50
Romans 15:4 134
Romans 15:4 223
Romans 15:30-32 268
Romans 16:16 63
Romans 16:17 143
1 Corinthians 1:2 63
1 Corinthians 1:12 39
1 Corinthians 2:11-12 82
1 Corinthians 2 237
1 Corinthians 3:6 160
1 Corinthians 3:16 185
1 Corinthians 5:1-13 238
1 Corinthians 5:11-13 237
1 Corinthians 5:13 141
1 Corinthians 6:1-8 305
1 Corinthians 7:14 100
1 Corinthians 7:15: 100
1 Corinthians 9:1 20
1 Corinthians 9:20 83
1 Corinthians 10:32-33 83
1 Corinthians 11:14 128
1 Corinthians 11:30 296
1 Corinthians 11:31 237
1 Corinthians 12:9-30 176
1 Corinthians 12:28 17
1 Corinthians 13 81
1 Corinthians 13:8 297
1 Corinthians 13:8-11 18
1 Corinthians 13:9-12 81
1 Corinthians 14:37 17
1 Corinthians 15:1-4 135
1 Corinthians 15:22 11
1 Corinthians 15:23 282
1 Corinthians 15:42-50-53-54 209
1 Corinthians 15:44 282
1 Corinthians 15 11
1 Corinthians 16:9 76

2 Corinthians 1:21-22 180
2 Corinthians 1:22 33
2 Corinthians 1:24 147
2 Corinthians 2:12 46
2 Corinthians 6:12 301
2 Corinthians 8:4 154
2 Corinthians 8:19 173
2 Corinthians 9:13 154
2 Corinthians 12:12 20
2 Corinthians 12:12 46
Galatians 1:2-22 63
Galatians 2:15 128
Galatians 3:14-23-25-26 147
Galatians 3:19 125
Galatians 3:19-29 230
Galatians 3:23 125
Galatians 4:6 180
Galatians 4:6 184
Galatians 4:6 185
Galatians 4:7 125
Galatians 4:8 128
Galatians 6:8 159
Galatians 6:10 147
Ephesians 1:13 33
Ephesians 1:13-14 180
Ephesians 2:1 11
Ephesians 2:3 127
Ephesians 2:8 147
Ephesians 2:15 231
Ephesians 2:19-22 18
Ephesians 2:21-22 185
Ephesians 3:14-21 269
Ephesians 3:17 147
Ephesians 4:5 42
Ephesians 4:8-16 18
Ephesians 4:11-13 17
Ephesians 4:11-13 20
Ephesians 4:11-16 297
Ephesians 4:12-13 81
Ephesians 4:18 301
Ephesians 4:30 33

Philippians 1:18 301
Philippians 1:19 268
Philippians 2:1 301
Philippians 7:12-20 301
Philippians 22 268
Colossians 1:9-13 269
Colossians 1:13 227
Colossians 2:12 207
Colossians 2:14 231
Colossians 3:12 301
Colossians 4:12 268
1 Thessalonians 5:23 300
2 Thessalonians 2 16
2 Thessalonians 2:9-12 149
2 Thessalonians 2:11-12 145
1 Timothy 1:19 147
1 Timothy 3:2 266
1 Timothy 4:6 147
1 Timothy 4:14 17
1 Timothy 5:6 11
1 Timothy 5:8 192
1 Timothy 5:10 157
1 Timothy 5:13 322
1 Timothy 5:17 50
1 Timothy 5:24-25 298
1 Timothy 6:5 141
1 Timothy 6:12 147
1 Timothy 6:15-16 208
1 Timothy 6:16 123
1 Timothy 6:17-19 243
2 Timothy 2:1-2 18
2 Timothy 3:15-17 134
2 Timothy 4:5 18
2 Timothy 4:21 30
2 Timothy 4:21 31
Philemon 2:13 160
Philemon 3:8-9 325
Hebrews 2:3-4 46
Hebrews 4:12 300
Hebrews 4:12 301
Hebrews 4:13 300

Hebrews 6:1 ... 323
Hebrews 6:2 ... 42
Hebrews 6:1-2 ... 17
Hebrews 7:1 ... 253
Hebrews 7:11-12 ... 125
Hebrews 8:3-4 ... 217
Hebrews 8:6-13 ... 231
Hebrews 12:28 ... 227
James 5:11 ... 220
James 5:13 ... 296
James 5:14-15 ... 175
1 Peter 1:22 ... 187
1 Peter 1:22 ... 188
1 Peter 3:12 ... 268
2 Peter 1:8 ... 322
2 Peter 1:5-11 ... 190
2 Peter 1:16-19 ... 140
2 Peter 1:19-21 ... 134
2 Peter 2:13 ... 239
1 John 3:9 ... 52
1 John 3:14 ... 241
1 John 3:17 ... 301
1 John 4:3 ... 16
1 John 5:1 ... 146
2 John 1:1 ... 133
Jude 1:6-7 ... 168
Jude 1:9 ... 258
Revelation 1:4 ... 63
Revelation 1:6 ... 95
Revelation 1:9 ... 227
Revelation 15:4 ... 124
Revelation 18:4 ... 290
Revelation 21:3-5 ... 279
Revelation 22:16-17 ... 180

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
the Querists' Drawer, a Discussion of D
Ref BR96.E7
3480400026836
W9-BJE-063